

July 15

sion treaty would be negotiated between NATO and the Warsaw Pact.

If and when such a nonaggression accord is reached, it will expressly exclude recognition of East Germany.

At the adamant demand of Chancellor Adenauer, Kennedy insisted on this and Khrushchev has tentatively agreed to it.

With the exception of France, all the other NATO members have approved the proposal to exchange East-West military missions. President de Gaulle so far has taken no stand on this; he has said neither yes nor no.

Other high French authorities are indicating he will not oppose it, and eventually will probably agree to it.

This closely guarded Kennedy-Khrushchev "understanding in principle," which is now beginning to unfold in public, is the culmination of many months of involved and circuitous parleying and maneuvering through: first, the 30-odd personal letters exchanged between the President and the Soviet ruler; second, the former's recent junket to Europe; third, Belgian Foreign Minister Paul Henri Spaak's talks in Kiev with Khrushchev this week; and fourth, Under Secretary Averell Harriman's trip to Moscow next week to discuss the proposed limited nuclear test ban.

Spaak's widely fanfared trip to Kiev was preceded by another equally significant but unpublished journey made by the former NATO Secretary General and Assistant Defense Secretary Paul Nitze.

They made the rounds of all the NATO powers to sound them out on Kennedy's compromise proposal to exchange military missions between NATO and the Warsaw Pact.

This was the President's answer to Khrushchev's demand for a nonaggression treaty between the two alliances. He offered exchanging military missions as "a first step," with a treaty to follow at some future date.

It was the President's contention this evolutionary process is necessary to "create the required public atmosphere" in the West.

While in Germany, the President personally outlined his plan to Chancellor Adenauer. The soon-to-retire aged leader agreed to go along on one condition—that recognition of East Germany be expressly excluded from a nonaggression pact, if and when there ever is one.

Armed with this almost unanimous NATO backing—France excepted—Spaak flew to Russia and put Kennedy's compromise up to Khrushchev.

The Kremlin ruler accepted it—pending the outcome of the test ban deliberations. But he vigorously stressed to Spaak that "sooner or later the West will have to come to terms with East Germany"; that this is one demand Russia will insist be faced.

Khrushchev also told Spaak he is prepared to go along on a nuclear test ban limited to the atmosphere and underwater.

It is the President's theory this will clear the way for an eventual ban on underground testing subject to some form of effective inspection. Only time will tell whether there is any basis for his optimism.

Under Secretary Harriman is not expected to work out the actual details of a ban agreement. His primary mission is to formulate the general basis of such an accord. The specific provisions will be drafted by specialists later; probably at the Geneva Disarmament Conference now in recess.

Signing of a final agreement will probably take place at the United Nations. Khrushchev has indicated willingness to go there for this purpose.

The President and Prime Minister Macmillan also would attend. Their presence almost certainly would lead to a summit conference which might deal with other major East-West tensions and problems—such as Soviet troops in Cuba, strife-torn Laos, West Berlin.

All these grandiose plans and objectives are still highly "iffy."

The high unpredictable tiger the President is riding is clearly spelled out in a National Security Council "position paper" circulating in top administration quarters. One especially significant portion is as follows:

"East Germany is a problem of particular moment. To indicate that we regard the division of Germany as permanent would be to shake West German confidence in the West and thus jeopardize effective German participation in the European and Atlantic Communities.

"On the other hand, it will probably not be possible to insulate ourselves from dealings with the East German regime over the long term. Such dealings need not preclude ultimate reunification and might, if effectively conducted, accelerate the process.

"In line with this assessment, we should adopt a middle of the road policy. We should be prepared to do business with the East German regime, as the need arises, on a technical level—much as the West Germans do. We should encourage the West Germans to take a more forthcoming and confident view of such relations between the United States and East Germany, and to expand rather than contract their own contacts with East Germans.

"We should not, however, agree to official recognition to East Germany, nor expect the West Germans to do so at this time."

Honor Students Discuss Challenge of Space Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1963

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the 34th annual commencement of the Wilson High School at West Lawn, Pa., seven honor students made excellent addresses which reflect the thinking of our youth about the challenges of the space age.

The principal commencement address was delivered by Dr. Eugene M. Emme, a historian of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. The awards to the honor student were presented by Mr. Clayton D. Rehrer, secondary principal.

Wilson High School is in the suburban area near Reading. It has the distinction of being an outstanding school.

Every year the senior class comes to Washington to get an inside look at their Congress and to visit historic national shrines.

The addresses given by the seven honor students and the quality of its graduating students reflect the devotion of a talented and dedicated faculty at Wilson High headed by Supervising Principal William C. Kutz.

The award winners were Dale E. Witver, Lee A. Miller, Wilbert J. Matz, Jr., Frederic R. Barth, John S. Saylor III, H. Theodore Stump, and Christopher Craig.

Mr. Speaker, those among us who look to the future with fear and pessimism may take some comfort in knowing that in growing numbers, our Nation's youth

are thinking and preparing to meet the challenge of the space age.

Their interest in health education, character development, cultural understanding, intelligent use of leisure time, vocational preparation, and good citizenship as reflected in the following essays is a good omen for our Nation's future.

GREETINGS AND INTRODUCTION

(By Dale E. Witver)

Fellow classmates, faculty, parents, and friends of the class, it gives me great pleasure to initiate the commencement program of the class of 1963. The theme "Education for the Space Age" is certainly a most appropriate one.

Our recent space efforts can be likened to the first flights at Kitty Hawk. They, too, were first unmanned but were followed by manned flights, completely preplanned and of a few seconds' duration. Their experiments were, again, power limited, but they soon progressed beyond that point. Space exploration is now at that same stage of development.

In the process of conquering space, a common, but very important, factor cannot be overlooked. This factor is the individual. The enigma of the individual in the space age is a major problem in the world today; we dare not become mere mechanical machines. Our school systems are the natural places for the preparation of the individual. Here, along with the emphasis placed on the sciences and mathematics, other values are stressed. Among these are character, citizenship, health, leisure, vocations, and cultural understanding—our six topics for tonight.

Our guest speaker, Dr. Eugene M. Emme, NASA historian, is going to present the challenges of space exploration. However, the present developments are only the beginning; as the key to one horizon of scientific achievement is found, a door to another and far more complex horizon is opened. There are an infinite number of horizons, keys, and doors. Who can foresee what the future will hold for coming generations?

Time will not permit my six classmates to go into detail on any of the phases of education that will be discussed. But they do hope that they will impress upon you the importance of keeping our educational program in line with the progress of science and space exploration, for the development of the individual is an increasingly vital factor in today's world.

HEALTH EDUCATION

(By Lee A. Miller)

At a time when the world is full of dangers for America, when a new frontier, space, must be conquered, the strength of this Nation as a leader for freedom-loving nations lies with the collective well-being of our people. The adults and youth of America need to develop a level of physical, mental, moral, and spiritual fitness which no other group of people in this world can match.

The vital drive which propels all life has brought America to the point of a cosmic awareness that her people must conquer the obstacles of space and communism if the kind of life we lead is to continue. To accomplish this task, the health and physical fitness of America must be such that each individual has the gift of quick recovery from the stress of a day's work, the ability and energy to carry a heavy schedule of studies, the strength to control his emotions in time of crisis such as the cold war areas of Cuba, Vietnam, Berlin, and the Congo, and the ability to compete both physically and professionally with the other Communist nations of the world. If Amer-

1963

Behind The Iron Curtain: I Won't Tell Them About Supreme Court, They Think We're a Christian Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PATRICK MINOR MARTIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1963

Mr. MARTIN of California. Mr. Speaker, the following article, written by one of my constituents, ran on the front page of the Imperial Valley Press, Imperial, Calif., on the Fourth of July 1963. It should cause the State Department to check its sources of information about liberty under the Communists; it should also cause each Member of this Congress to pause before casting a vote authorizing continuing aid to any nation ruled by the Communists; at the very least, it calls for corrective legislation to permit Bible reading on a noncompulsory basis in public schools. Under unanimous consent I include Mary Dold's article in the Appendix of the RECORD:

BEHIND THE IRON CURTAIN: I WON'T TELL
THEM ABOUT SUPREME COURT, THEY THINK
WE'RE A CHRISTIAN NATION

(By Mary Ann Dold)

In March I made a short visit to Prague, Czechoslovakia. From my experiences in a country where Communists rule and individual freedoms do not exist, I developed a deep sense of pride for my country. Today, in view of Americans' attitude of complacency, I regard my country with shame and pity.

During my visit behind the Iron Curtain, I met with the youth of the Baptist Church in Prague. I witnessed people whose freedom of religion was being thwarted. These people were persecuted for their belief in God. I met students who had been expelled from the Charles University. I met children whose fathers were in prison. I met young girls who worked long hours in factories. Other jobs were not available to them because one Sunday last December these young boys and girls stood up before their congregation in the presence of Communist officials and announced their belief in God.

I joined hands and prayed with these people. We prayed that the Iron Curtain might some day be lifted and they could join us in America. We thanked God for their freedom to worship Christ in their hearts.

The youth in Czechoslovakia taught me a lot about my country. America is their dream.

"America," they said, "is a country based on a Christian heritage. It is a nation under God. The words 'In God We Trust' are written on every coin. The phrase 'under God' is included in the flag salute. The people stand together in public and sing 'God Bless America.' Most important of all, the students can read about God in the classrooms.

"You know," they explained to me, "most of the students in our country have never even heard of God."

I correspond with two boys from the church. I'm not going to write them about the Supreme Court's recent decision to ban Bibles from the classroom. Perhaps they will read about it in their paper—for news like that is always welcomed by the Communists. If they should hear about it, I know they won't understand. They would say it is a lie, produced by the Communists.

"Surely," they will argue, "the Christians will use their freedom of speech and unite in a protest against such a decision. After all, what do American Christians have to lose? There are no Communists to put the fathers in prison, to send the children to factories and keep the students out of the universities. No, the idea of Americans letting their great 'nation under God' lose its Christian foundation, is too absurd."

I'll just send them a newspaper clipping of us Americans at our big Fourth of July celebrations.

Kennedy's Two-Faced Cuban Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, when will the American people be told the truth—when it is too late?

In the July 10 issue of the Long Island Press, Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott tell about the incredible "Kennedy Policy" on Cuba:

KENNEDY'S CUBA POLICY A TWO-FACED THING?

(By Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott)

WASHINGTON.—President Kennedy's Cuban policy has an increasing resemblance to Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde.

While State Department spokesmen are publicly proclaiming the administration's firm intention to continue to isolate the Red-ruled island, the President's inner council of policy advisers is privately pursuing an exactly opposite course.

Without a single protest, these White House authorities are permitting large quantities of oil from Western and Communist countries to flow into Cuba to keep Castro's sagging economy operating and his Soviet-equipped and dominated military machine running.

The President's assistants are even proceeding with a closely guarded plan to resume diplomatic relations with Castro by sending a charge d'affaires to Havana.

The carefully masked face of the administration's Cuban policy is clearly reflected in Navy reports on the steadily increasing volume of Western and Communist shipping to Cuba, surveys by the Maritime Administration, and high significant discussions among top administration officials.

Naval Intelligence's latest reports disclose that 429 Russian-satellite and 205 Western vessels arrived in Cuba in the first 6 months of 1963. The Maritime Administration, which lacks certain clandestine information available to the Navy, states that "at least 167 free world ships docked in Cuba since January 1, 1963."

According to the Navy's unpublished estimate, 96 of the Russian-satellite vessels were tankers carrying vital supplies of oil, kerosene, and aviation gasoline to Soviet and Castro military forces.

Both of these official reports also reveal the disturbing fact that in the past 3 months an increasing number of ships flying free-world flags have been showing up in Cuban ports, under contract to Soviet bloc countries.

Most of these ships (39 in April, 42 in May, and 53 in June) are of British registry, although many actually are owned by nationals of Greece, Italy, and Norway.

THE OIL TRAFFIC

Of the Western ships plying the Cuban trade, 21 are tankers, 13 of them flying the

British flag. Three other tankers are Greek, three Norwegian, and two Italian.

In overall tonnage, these tankers represent nearly one-fourth of the 1,031,517 tons of Western shipping now serving Cuba.

These Western tankers averaged two trips to Cuba in the first 6 months, according to the Navy, indicating the vessels are regularly assigned to transporting Western oil there.

As administration policy is to blacklist only individual ships and not the entire fleet of an owner, these foreign operators find it highly profitable—and safe—to assign certain vessels to the Cuban trade.

This glaring loophole makes utterly meaningless the loudly ballyhooed blacklist the only concrete measure so far taken to curb Western shipping.

Repeated efforts by congressional leaders to put teeth into the administration's shipping blacklist have been disregarded by the President and his policy advisers. They claim stiffer measures would lead to vehement objections by U.S. allies, particularly Britain.

Significantly, these potent White House lieutenants are suppressing a Defense Intelligence Agency report indicating that considerable quantities of strategic lubricating oil, processed in the United States and used in ground-to-air missile systems, have turned up in Cuba after being transhipped from another country.

This same report also reveals that Venezuelan oil is finding its way to Cuba by transshipment through European and Latin American firms.

SHIFTING POLICY

As reported in this column on June 19, President Kennedy is seriously considering a State Department proposal to resume diplomatic ties with Castro.

As a first step, the President is contemplating reopening the U.S. Embassy in Havana by sending a charge d'affaires there. Under the plan, this would take place in September. At present, the Swiss are handling U.S. affairs in Cuba.

The closely guarded move to "normalize" relations with Communist puppet Dictator Castro is linked directly with the President's elaborate maneuvers to ease tensions with Russia.

If the resumption of diplomatic ties with Castro can be brought off, the President then contemplates a gradual relaxation of the trade ban on Cuba. The administration's decision to drop plans to ask the Organization of American States to declare a sweeping economic embargo against Cuba is a direct result of these new policy considerations.

BEHIND THE NEWS

Chicago newspapers owe their interviews with Benjamin J. Davis, national secretary of the U.S. Communist Party, during the NAACP convention, to an FBI tip, giving his hotel and room number. The G-men wanted to alert the public to the Communists' secret scheme to move in to take over demonstrations and sessions.

Another Yalta appears to be in the wind, with the same authors telling us why:

RUSSIA-UNITED STATES NONAGGRESSION PACT
IN THE WIND

(By Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott)

WASHINGTON.—President Kennedy and Premier Khrushchev already have reached an understanding "in principle" to ban nuclear weapons tests in the atmosphere and underwater and on a compromise tie between NATO and the Warsaw Pact.

The later is to consist of an exchange of military missions between the Western and Soviet bloc alliances.

Establishment of this relationship would be the first step in an overall plan under which, sometime in the future, a nonaggression

instilled new hope in the people behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains to help fight in their strong desire to again enjoy their independence. Since the resolution was enacted, we have reaffirmed our position in supporting this cause. I rise today to endorse and support the Presidential proclamation to set aside this week in further observance of the plight of captive nations.

What can be accomplished through this public announcement? It serves a twofold purpose. One, we keep the free people of the world enlightened to the tragic consequences that are experienced under Communist rule, and two, we create problems for the Communist rulers, in that they must devote a great deal of time and manpower to try and contain these captive nations. We have created a stumbling block means their path toward world domination. They cannot invade their plans for this quest without strong resistance to their rule established in their own backyard. Inside this resistance death they could deploy the manpower needed to contain it to other fronts and continue their quest toward world rule. We have created a roadblock against this movement and we must strengthen it by continuing our maneuverance behind their backs.

To make this proclamation to be effective, we must have no effect in our own hearts for a free world. And yet, the hardships of our world of discrimination to the people of the captive nations stimulates their hopes and their determination against despair and resignation. Their spirit grows with each passing day and a forecast statement of American purpose based on the very right of self-determination, as we publicly declare this week, will add energy to this spirit so that their independence will be won by rejecting the Communist efforts and riding their hand of this menace.

There are 1 billion captives in the Communist empire. By uniting these people to our cause for freedom and justice in the world we can defeat the objectives as stated by the Chinese last week in Moscow. There is strength in unity and presently the free world is more united than the Communist world. We must retain this position so that the crumbling of the Communist bloc can be final and complete when the day of world independence arrives.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, this marks the 25th consecutive year that the Congress has observed Captive Nations Week to bring worldwide attention to the plight of the people of two dozen nations in the world who are being held captive by the tyranny and oppression of communism. Congress adopted the first Captive Nations Week resolution in 1949 and President Eisenhower enthusiastically issued an appropriate proclamation. This year, observance of Captive Nations Week is more important than ever to remind the world of the true imperialistic policies of the Soviet Union and its Communist satellites.

In this observance we also wish to remind these captive peoples that the free world has not forgotten their subjugation and suppression, and will not

forget it. We share their desire that they will know real freedom in their country again, and we pledge our continued efforts to help them restore liberty and justice to their nations.

The role of captive nations includes countries all around the world including Cuba, only 90 miles off our shores. They include all of the countries of Eastern Europe, such as Poland and Hungary; many nations now incorporated into the Soviet Union, like the Ukraine and Lithuania; and still others like North Korea and Red China.

None of these nations has chosen communism of its own free will; in each case it was thrust on them from outside, either by direct intervention of the Soviet Union or by indirect subversion and violence supported by Moscow. If these nations were given the right to choose freely their own political system, communism would be quickly rejected. They remain captives of communism today, but because Communist armed forces are used to suppress their desire for freedom and independence.

Many of us are ready willing to do what we can to help these nations free themselves from Communist rule. We must continue to work for the right of self-determination for all people. We must continue to work for the right of self-determination for all people. We must continue to work for the right of self-determination for all people. We must continue to work for the right of self-determination for all people.

We in the United States understand that the right of self-determination of people everywhere is a basic principle, and we know that as long as any nation is oppressed, the nation is not free. On this occasion of the observance of Captive Nations Week, we must make known our support of freedom for all and hold high the torch of liberty as a beacon of hope for all the captive nations of the world.

Mr. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, Captive Nations Week, now being observed for the fifth time as an annual commemoration, has become a widely recognized occasion for the American people to reflect upon the continuing fate of the millions of oppressed people of Eastern Europe and of other lands held in bondage by Communist dictatorships.

Since the establishment of Captive Nations Week by the Congress in 1949, the number of the captive nations is now also the closest to the shores of the United States, a fact which has brought home to our people more forcefully than ever before the harsh reality of what it is we observe this week.

The existence in Cuba of an avowedly Communist government—maintaining itself by force of arms, disrupting the country's economy, subverting its neighbors' freedom, persecuting its own people, betraying its own independence to a foreign power—has revealed as though on the broadest movie screen the full picture of Communist influence and duplicity, and the danger of such a regime to the United States and the entire free world. What was easy to ignore in Europe has now come to haunt us

because the Soviet Union has consistently violated its solemn promises to respect the right of self-determination and free elections the road to freedom and independence for the captive peoples must continue to be a long and hazardous one. But it is a road we cannot weary of following. Not only is our own safety at stake, but the most fundamental principle on which we have established our Nation are involved. As the attitude of human freedom in a world half slave and half free, we cannot shrink from the leadership which our strength, our position and our principles have imposed upon us. We must lose no opportunity to use our diplomatic and moral resources, and to enlist the support of our free world allies, in seeking to help restore the personal and political freedoms to which every nation and every human being has a God-given right.

Captive Nations Week this year occurs at the onset of what could be highly significant negotiations in Moscow between the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union dealing with the possibility of a nuclear test ban treaty and, likewise, encompassing what conceivably could be more extensive agreements. This year's observance is as meaningful as others have been; then it will serve to remind our opponents everywhere of a fact of life in the United States—we shall never consent to or accept the permanent Communist domination of Eastern Europe. Our devotion to freedom there and throughout the world is not negotiable.

Our responsibility, Mr. Speaker, do not stop with consideration of the fate of nations already caught in the trap of Communist tyranny. If the captive nations hold any meaning for us at all, and how can we avoid that meaning? then they signify above all the past failures and missed opportunities of the free world—the failure to act soon enough and surely enough to strengthen legitimate governments, to cooperate in helping meet the needs of poorer countries, to encourage the extension of personal freedoms to people deprived of their human rights. Other nations are in danger today, and now is an appropriate time to strengthen our resolve to firm up the foundations of freedom wherever they are threatened.

ILLEGAL TRAVEL BY U.S. CITIZENS, INCLUDING STUDENTS AND MEMBERS OF THE "COMMITTEE FOR NON-VIOLENT ACTION"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CHAMBER) is recognized for 30 minutes.

(Mr. CHAMBER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CHAMBER. Mr. Speaker, it is my intention to discuss a recent matter which has come to my attention, and also to discuss the basic question of travel by U.S. citizens to Cuba which is illegal, and as I am sure Members of this House know which I have strongly opposed. I intend to state the reasons why. I hope, perhaps, to cast a little

bit of light on this particular situation. The reason for taking the House floor today in particular is because of a matter that has been called to my attention with regard to a new trip being planned and proposed, by U.S. citizens—and some foreigners—who are members of the Committee for Non-Violent Action—which came to my attention as a result of monitoring Radio Havana. And this is what Radio Havana now reports concerning new trips by U.S. students; and this, incidentally, also includes certain foreign students traveling to Cuba for the purpose of demanding, and traveling through the United States to highlight that demand, that the United States withdraw its troops from Guantanamo, even though we are there by treaty right.

What am I talking about? CMQ Havana broadcast on July 5 the following information:

There are three student groups participating in a march through the United States asking the Government to evacuate the Guantanamo Base. They agreed yesterday to meet at Griffiss Air Force Base.

Which, parenthetically I state is in Rome, N.Y.

The students met on July 3 in New York and said that their march would end at Guantanamo Base, despite the fact that the U.S. Government arbitrarily maintains prohibitions against U.S. citizens visiting Cuba.

This is Havana Radio speaking which, of course, is the Government of Cuba, which are the Communists, speaking. Again on July 9 Radio Progreso, Havana, said:

It was announced in New York that participants of the "march for peace" left Rome yesterday en route to Cuba, after having made a final demonstration of American territory (U.S. base of Biki in Italy)—

Incidentally, demanding that we withdraw our troops from that base as well—with their final goal being Guantanamo Base. The group will be joined by 8 others, from Quebec, Canada, and 12 from Cleveland, Ohio, "reiterating their decision to continue the peaceful fight for Cuba."

The members of the group pointed out that the "fight for peace in the Caribbean is a necessary condition for peace in all of the world."

They will travel through North American territory, from north to south, until they arrive in Florida, where they will arrive at the city of Guantanamo, more than 3,500 miles of journey.

They announced they would "continue making acts of protest against the aggressions of the United States against Cuba," and are journeying to Guantanamo, "despite the official Yankee measures that prohibit North Americans to journey to Cuba."

I assume that from Florida they will go to Cuba in a manner similar to the route taken by the 59 U.S. students who are there today, who are there extolling throughout the world the virtues of Castroism and communism in this hemisphere and throughout the world. As a matter of fact, one of these students even went so far as to call Castro a "saint" while visiting in Cuba. I shall comment on that in just a moment.

Apparently the route these people intend to take will be similar to that taken by the 59 students going through Prague, Czechoslovakia, to Havana, having got-

ten visas and passports from our State Department to go to London and to Amsterdam.

So where are we? Well, they announce, these new students, that they will continue to make "acts of protest against aggressions of the United States against Cuba, despite the official Yankee measures that prohibit North Americans from traveling to Cuba." The State Department's soft line on the illegal travel by the 59 American students now being brainwashed by the Communists in Cuba has apparently encouraged further demonstrations of this kind and further travel to Cuba. If the State Department continues to refuse to enforce the law that makes travel to Cuba illegal, further demonstrations of this kind and further statements from Cubans extolling the revolution can become one of Castro's and communism's greatest propaganda weapons. These people have announced their intention to travel to Cuba through the United States and, therefore, should not be allowed to continue their propagandizing of Castro and communism on U.S. soil or permitted to go to Cuban soil through our acquiescence in order to accomplish this same objective. How foolish is this thing getting to be? The precedent has now been set. This new trip has now been announced. I have demanded that the State Department call a halt to the actions underway. What is wrong with this?

It has been interesting to me to read some of the editorial reactions to the demand that the law of the United States be obeyed. Title 2, U.S.C., section 1185, specifically says that when the President so proclaims U.S. citizens shall be denied the right to travel to specific countries because it is in the best interest of the United States that they be so denied. That is a law passed by the U.S. Congress with the obvious objective of not permitting U.S. citizens directly or indirectly to aid or abet the enemy.

Some say, Is Castro really the enemy? The President himself has said so by upholding this with the proclamation of January 16, 1961, denying such travel. That was President Eisenhower. President Kennedy and the State Department previously stated their intention to uphold this proclamation and the law itself. The Government of the United States now has the duty to enforce that law. The United States, the President, as I started to say, President Kennedy, has twice invoked the Trading With the Enemy Act as it relates to Cuba. This in effect states Castro is the enemy of freedom and of our Government's objectives in this hemisphere under the law. The Trading With the Enemy Act was invoked with regard to tobacco shipments last year. The Trading With the Enemy Act was invoked again just a few weeks ago by the President relating to Cuba. The United States has withdrawn recognition of Cuba and continuing communications, continuing visitations, without express permission of the State Department are in violation of that basic foreign policy objective of the eventual political and economic quarantine of Cuba. These are some of the things that are wrong about it.

We have cut off travel to numerous other countries for other reasons, and still do: North Korea, North Vietnam, Red China, Albania, and Cuba. All passports of the United States, partially as a result of my objections to travel to Cuba, are now so stamped. Every passport issued is stamped as not valid for travel to those countries, including Cuba. This is the U.S. policy. If the State Department does not uphold the law it is inviting violation of the law.

What are some other reasons why this is a proper action to be taken and why the law should be obeyed? I read the press reports this morning and heard on the radio that a U.S. citizen, one of the 59, was killed yesterday in Santiago. We heard that he was swimming in a swimming pool on a hot day, sweltering heat, in Santiago and drowned. The news report did not give Bob Hill's home address and gave no further explanation. I think this illustrates another reason for banning travel to countries in which the United States has no embassy and does not recognize the countries, and therefore cannot protect the citizens of the United States who travel to those countries. We do not know how Bob Hill was killed. We do not know whether there was anything wrong in regard to action by Castro or the Communists. We have no way of knowing about it. There is no protection for future Bob Hills in these countries because we have no embassies to accomplish that protection. That is one of the additional reasons for denying travel to these countries.

A further reason is obvious in connection with this present student visitation, these 59 students that are there, when they go to these Communist countries, which even include Russia—and I have been there. I have been there under the sponsorship of the Intourist Travel Agency. They show you just exactly what they want you to see, and nothing more. There is no such thing as free travel in Red China, in North Vietnam, in North Korea. There is no such thing as free travel in Cuba. These students, some of them apparently, were bilked into thinking that if they went to Cuba, they would be able to see what the revolution was all about and what is going on. Well, the only thing they get to see is what Castro lets them see and what the Communists let them see.

This trip is being sponsored by the Student Union Federation of Cuba which is headed by a known Communist, Ronald Cubelo, assisted by Angelo Quevada, another Communist. It is under the direct sponsorship of the Cuban Government and the Cuban Government, as a matter of fact, is paying the bill, as I stated in the Record just the other day. Here are some of the other organizations that are sponsoring this trip. There is Armando Hart. He is the Communist head of the educational department in Cuba, the Cuban Ministry of Education, directly under the Cuban Government. He is the one who is issuing the orders. He is the one who is pulling the strings concerning this visit. Everyone else involved in the invitation

July 15

What else is wrong with this travel to Cuba proposition? We have imposed a ban on not only travel but on economic interchange between the United States and Cuba for some time. A trade ban aimed at all free-world trading with Cuba has been imposed, partially at least. We have stopped trading with Cuba. To permit these students, to permit this other group that is now talking about going to Cuba, to go to that country does what? As Castro himself says and as was stated in another of these Havana radio broadcasts we have monitored, this is an effective way of breaking the dollar curtain. And it certainly is. The Communists on the Havana radio are bragging about these 59 students and what they symbolize. The implication is they expect to break the dollar curtain that has been placed around Cuba by the United States. If this is permitted to continue, there is no question but what tourist dollars will be flowing to Cuba. This would undercut all of the basic policies of an economic and political quarantine of Cuba in order to squeeze the Communists out of this hemisphere.

This is another thing that is wrong with it: We have asked all other countries in this hemisphere to stop travel to Cuba. The Selden subcommittee of the House and the Senate subcommittee of the other body on subversives in Latin America and in this country on the Senate side clearly showed that Cuba is being used as an island for subversive training and that those trainees are going to all other countries throughout this hemisphere in order to spread Castro's communism, Khrushchev's communism to those other countries, and they are doing it effectively.

Mr. Cone, Director of Intelligence, stated to the Selden committee that no less than 1,500 had gone to Cuba for the purpose of attending these subversive schools in 1962 alone, naming some of the places where the schools were located. These 59 students are now in Cuba and they, intentionally or otherwise, are being put through the Communist subversive training program. That is what is wrong with it. How foolish we look insisting that all Latin American countries stop subversive travel to Cuba and we let 59 of our students go there for brainwashing.

The security of the United States is involved, the basic security of our country. An additional purpose for not permitting people to travel to these other countries which the United States does not recognize, these other countries which this Nation has stated are the enemies of this country, involves our security. The security aspect is involved and there is no way in the world that our Government can control what someone does when they go to those countries, what information they may leak to those governments or what may be brought back to this country for subversive purposes. The basic security of our Nation is involved in all of this travel. That is one of the reasons why travel is forbidden in these "enemy" foreign countries. Few exceptions exist and they must get permission from our State Department to do so and then only if it is in the best

interests of this country to let specific individuals for specific purposes travel there.

Business people now in the United States are talking about traveling to Red China. There are a number of them and they are attempting to get permission to travel to Red China. The objective is the obvious—to do what the Congress of the United States said shall not be done; that is, to open up trade between Red China and the free world, meaning the United States in particular. Red China already trades with Great Britain. So the objective in the first instance is to go to that brutal Communist country to try to create additional markets in Red China. That is the objective on the part of these U.S. businessmen. If you are going to open up trade with Red China the next thing will be a demand for recognition, which has not been made, and a demand for seating them in the United Nations. All of these matters the Congress of the United States and, I am confident, the people of the United States oppose.

There is a further basic aspect of this; namely, the fact that the State Department has done nothing to prevent these students from traveling and has shown a rather soft attitude about it and has not stated its intention to seek their prosecution when they get back. That appears to me to be a step in the direction of coexistence with Castro and communism in this hemisphere, which possibly was best exemplified by the President's remarks at American University when he said—and this is the first explanation I have had as to why our policy is what it is as it relates to Cuban communism that—

We should reexamine our attitude toward the Soviet Union—

And that—

Additional communication means additional understanding between the Communist countries and the United States.

The word "accommodations" was mentioned, and certainly permitting students to go to Cuba is in the form of an accommodation. So this involves the basic fundamental concepts of our foreign relations in the cold war. All the efforts I have seen lead to the conclusion that we are rapidly on the way, this being another element of proof in that regard, toward coexistence with Castro and communism in this hemisphere.

Let me give you another example that disturbs me.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I will be delighted to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DEVINE. I would like to compliment the gentleman from Florida for rendering what I think is a great service to his country. The gentleman from Pinellas County, Fla., has been an ardent fighter against Communist subversion situations, and the whole Cuban mess. We do not read much about Cuba any more. I do not know whether the administration, because of other failures wants to sweep it under the rug, but it appears to be that. The gentleman from Florida, Mr. Cramer, the gentleman from

Iowa, is involved here and I think he should be recognized for the tremendous job that he is doing in the interests of national security.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the gentleman from Ohio very much. Of course he likewise has been a fighter in the effort to get this country to follow a firm anti-Communist policy at home and abroad. I appreciate his kind remarks.

These are the signs of the times that bother me. For instance, here is another example, not only in the travel of students and people to Cuba, but now we find that there is a proposal pending and that permission is being asked for the reinstatement of the ferry and shipping line between Key West and Havana. As I informed the House previously, there were other signs with regard to communications and travel, such as the United States permitting Cuban non-scheduled airlines to travel over the United States going to Canada so long as they stopped at one of our major airports for inspection, including Dulles Airport outside Washington, D.C. Here you have the anomalous and almost unthinkable situation of Communist Cuban planes flying over and stopping in the area of Washington, D.C., on their way to and from Canada. Also a week later the United States announced that the ban on U.S. commercial airlines scheduled to go across Cuba was being withdrawn. Yet they said there was not a deal made on those two subjects. I think the facts speak for themselves. You can imagine the U.S. Government lifting such a ban if they had not been convinced in the first instance by some assurance given to them by the Castro government that our commercial planes would not be attacked. Why, of course not.

To get back to this proposal for opening up and renewing this ferry and shipping line between Key West and Havana, here is the proposal. It is for a ship, either the *Orange Sun* or the *O'Rion* to make three trips a week carrying 600 people on each trip. The ships have already been leased by an American firm headed by a British national. Castro apparently has already agreed to the deal. I called the State Department and asked them for information about it and objected to any such renewal of trade between the United States and Cuba.

To my amazement I was informed that the State Department indicated that there are not any laws to prevent the operation of a ferry service between Havana and Key West. I wonder since when? Does not the United States have the right to say what ships may enter its ports or trade with the enemy? I thought that this was the whole nexus and basis for the present trade ban now in existence, that the United States has the absolute right to state whether, for instance, any foreign company ships trading with Cuba can then use U.S. ports, and the United States has said no, they cannot. I just wonder how far the State Department will go in opening this door of accommodation with Castro. I am hopeful that they will not permit the reopening of this door of trade because that is another

element on the road to coexistence and accommodation with Castro.

Making this objection with regard to the 59 students, what was the reply that the State Department gave? This is almost unbelievable naivete on the part of the State Department. This is the day following my last statement on the floor of the House objecting to this student trip.

A Department spokesman, Robert McCloskey told a news conference, "We hope that these students would have the opportunity for frank exchange with students at Cuban University where traditional and classical autonomy has been lost to the dictates of the regime and academic freedom has disappeared in the stultification of Communist slogans."

That is the usual doubletalk of the State Department. They are on the one hand saying, "You have got communism in Cuba, you have got a stultification of Communist slogans, you have a lack of academic freedom," and then on the other hand showing the extent of their naivete by saying, "But we are convinced the Communists are going to show these students what the Communist revolution is really all about," implying that the students will thus find out what is wrong with it. This is the fuzzy-headed thinking of the State Department that evidences almost unbelievable naivete on their part.

I mentioned a minute ago something of the brainwashing that was going on and here is another example.

According to press reports Blas Roca, the prime mover of communism in Cuba for other 30 years—he was addressing these 59 U.S. students—told 59 American college students here on this illegal junket that Fidel Castro "began his study of Marxism early in life."

This was reported in the Communist newspaper Hoy:

The students paid a courtesy visit to Roca and Armed Forces Minister Raul Castro in the Hoy editorial offices yesterday.

Raul Castro unquestionably has been a Communist all his life and undoubtedly gave them a good brainwashing.

Roca, one-time president of the Communist Party in Cuba is now editor of Hoy.

This is what he said:

One thing that is not understood in the United States is that Comrade Fidel Castro, our leader and guide, began his study of Marxism early in life and began to assimilate the essentials of it.

Raul's wife, Vilma Espin, also met the American students. She had returned from a Moscow Women's Congress only 2 days ago, held in Moscow.

Roca told the American group, which includes 10 Negroes, that discrimination will not disappear until "there is no more exploitation, no more imperialism, which maintains Negroes and whites divided."

Obviously he was trying to brainwash the American students as relates to racial problems in this country, implying that citizens, Negro and white, are better off under communism where every one is a prisoner of the superstate.

Last night the students were feted at a rally in their honor at Liberty City—

formerly Camp Colombia—as guests of the Cuban Government.

That is the man who has been a Communist all his life and whose name I mentioned just a few minutes ago.

These are some of the things that are wrong with these visits.

The reaction to my remarks has been practically unanimously favorable, but the kind of people who are supporting these trips and these students is what interests me. There is no doubt in my mind that those who support them are those who likewise support and sympathize with the Communist cause in Cuba, even though they are U.S. citizens.

Here is some pretty conclusive proof. Here are some items that came to my office. Here is one that came from Miami, signed Janet Rosenberg. She states the address. We checked the address, and it obviously is a fake. She quotes the news article in July in which I called for prosecution of those on this trip.

"We dare you." Signed "Janet."

Here is another from Miami, "You ain't got a chance, man." Signed "Fidelito."

But listen to this. Here is a card apparently from somebody who if he is not a U.S. citizen is in this country by the grace of this free country. It was sent from New York City. It is signed "Alan deRosa." This is the thinking of the people living in the United States of America who support these brainwashing trips. I will read the last sentence first:

We need a Castro in the U.S.A. to bat the brains out of punks like you.

And he was writing to a Member of the U.S. Congress. Let us read the whole card.

I read that you are sponsoring action against the students visiting Cuba.

You big bum. If you punks in Washington did something for the benefit of the people instead of the vested interests, no one in the U.S.A. would have any interest in communism. The people in Cuba have kicked off the yoke of oppression. They have rid the country of the capitalist crooks of the exploiters and now are attempting to do something for the downtrodden people.

What are you doing for the people of the U.S.A.? Nothing, you bum. Just filling your own pockets and creating a bundle. We need a Castro in the U.S.A. to bat the brains out of punks like you.

ALAN DE ROSA.

This happened in the United States of America. This is someone living under the freedoms of this country, writing a Representative in the Congress in this fashion. Is there any doubt but what this person is a supporter of the Castro revolution and of the Communists in this hemisphere? I do not think so. I think it is the best evidence of who really is behind this trip of these 59 students and who undoubtedly would be behind the trip of these other students who are now planning to make this trip through the United States and visit Guantanamo.

It is my hope that the State Department will take a firm position with regard to these new travelers in the United States, these new students intending to go to Cuba. The State Department should be unequivocal about this, and

the most practical way to do it is not to give U.S. citizens passports to leave the United States intending to go to Cuba, or permission to these students to tour the United States on their way to Cuba which serves Castro's purpose and gives him, I think, one of the biggest propaganda victories and weapons to sow false propaganda he has had for a long time.

I include related editorials and articles on this subject supporting my position generally.

CASTRO'S 59 GUESTS

Not surprisingly, the 59 U.S. college students who went to Cuba in defiance of State Department warnings have been defended by a scattering of Americans. Their line is that the kids showed spunk and that the State Department has no business dictating travel taboos.

That second point is open to debate. A case can be made for the right of Americans to go anywhere as independent travelers, observers or fact gatherers, if they go on their own and take their own chances.

But advocates of that point of view make a pretty poor argument when they cite the 59 college rebels as a case in point.

The students' trip to Cuba can scarcely be called an independent venture in any sense. They have gone there by way of Prague as guests of the Castro regime—under the aegis of a front outfit called the Cuban Institute for Friendship Among Peoples.

A statement issued by the students in parting hinted that they thought Americans were being fed lies about the nature of the Castro regime and the living conditions of the Cuban people.

Dispatches from Havana since the students' arrival indicate that Castro is giving them the full red carpet treatment and doing his utmost to provide them with a selected view of the landscape.

This is the sort of abuse the State Department is trying to prevent as part of its general effort to isolate Cuba and short circuit Castro propaganda. The example of the 59 thus serves to justify, not weaken, the Department's restrictions on travel to Cuba.

Anyway, the State Department's aye or nay isn't all that counts. The real criterion is which prospective visitors the Castro regime will admit or refuse to admit. This, as much as anything, is what puts the trek of the 59 in such a questionable light.

[From the Tampa Tribune, July 8, 1963]

AN INVITATION TO DISRESPECT

The presence of 59 American students in Havana despite U.S. State Department warnings that they face possible jail terms and fines if they made the trip brings to mind an old Marine Corps maxim.

It goes something to the effect that you never point a gun at anyone unless you intend to pull the trigger, the theory being that frivolity with the weapon erodes respect for both the gun and the man behind it.

Insofar as its curb on Cuban travel is concerned, the State Department had done a powerful lot of pointing, but has pulled the trigger mighty little.

The State Department carefully makes the point that its prohibition does not apply to those who have legitimate reasons for travel to Cuba—newsmen, those with humanitarian reasons such as doctors, lawyers, and religious representatives, and those whose business interests on the island predate Castro.

But Congressman WILLIAM O. CRAMER, of Pinellas County, recently furnished the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee a list of 97 U.S. citizens who defied the State Department's ban and traveled to Cuba by way of Mexico during a 6-months period

in 1962. He also has been the subject of other sources of trips by additional Americans, including V. T. Lee, erstwhile head of the Tampa Fair Play for Cuba Committee, who was quoted in a Cuban magazine as having made a speech in "broken but emotion-packed Spanish" in Havana's Plaza de la Revolution declaring:

"I want you to know that my country is anxious to know the truth about this heroic island, first free territory of America and that it doesn't agree with Kennedy's aggressions. Some day together we will win."

The Senate subcommittee's records are replete with other such instances, including considerable indication that Lee just about comes and goes as he pleases where travel to Cuba is concerned. Yet only two U.S. citizens, Negro Newsmen William Worthly, and Mrs. Helen Maxine Levi Travis, of Los Angeles, have been prosecuted for violating the ban.

Such laxity is hardly curbing travel to Cuba. About all it's accomplishing is inviting disrespect for the State Department from U.S. citizens—and from governments such as Mexico's, which only recently has been prevailed upon to quit permitting Americans with nonvalid passports to use its airports as points of departure for forbidden travels to Castroland.

AMERICAN STUDENTS IN CUBA

For the first time since Castro came to power, the Communist regime honored our Fourth of July. The timing seems to indicate an increasing need for accommodation with the United States in view of his troubles with the guerrillas and massive resistance (see his speeches June 18 and 27). He also had a news peg on which to hang his co-existence—50 American students—and Guantanamo Base.

The following is a translation of broadcasts over the Cuban radio, July 8:

"Havana, radio progreso: Rector Juan Marinello (president of the Cuban Communist Party), of the University of Havana, presided over a brilliant meeting last night in the Magna Hall. Said Dr. Juan Marinello: 'The Fourth of July is a glorious day for humanity, not only for the United States.'"

The meeting took place as an act of honor to the 50 U.S. students who are visiting Cuba "to learn first hand the results of the Cuban revolution." Following the singing of both national anthems, the secretary of foreign relations of the student union, Roberto Vizcaino (Communist) presented the head of the student groups, Levi Laub, who said:

"I had no idea that tonight I was going to speak. If I had known it, I would not have come. I only want to say that we are happy over the kindness with which the people, and particularly the university students, are treating us."

"Our trip," Laub continued, "has been the cause of surprise in our country . . . although we have been here only a brief time, we have observed the warmth which which we have been treated, and hope that in a short time, the Cubans will visit us in our universities."

Later the same day, Radio Progreso announced:

"Today, July 5, the Association of the North American Friends of Cuba will celebrate Independence Day of the United States . . . and will hold a forum on the fight of the Negroes for their civil rights in the United States."

"Meeting with their resident compatriots in Cuba, will be the brave North American students who have journeyed to Cuba to see with their own eyes the truth of the Cuban revolution."

"Among the participants in the forum will be Robert Williams, well-known Negro fighter of the United States and a representative of the international press. (Williams is writing for Castro's propaganda news service Prensa Latina.)"

2004/06/23 : CIA-RDP65B00383R000200240015-0

Communist organ, Hoy, and held a round-table discussion with the Communist hierarchy of Cuba:

"The 50 young brave North American students are visiting our country to learn firsthand the Cuban revolution, were interviewed last night by the National Directorate of the PUR (Communist national direction of the government), Comandante Raul Castro, Vice Premier and Minister of Armed Forces; and Blas Roca, of Hoy. The President of the Federation of Cuban Women (Communist women's group for the penetration of Latin America) Vilma Espin de Castro, and Lazaro Pena, Secretary General of the Cuban Workers Federation (Pena has called repeatedly of workers in Venezuela and other countries to revolt against the imperialists—see speeches of January 1963) took part in the discussion."

The meeting took place in the offices of Hoy, whose director gave the students a history of the background of the paper since its foundation. For his part, Comandante Raul Castro, and his wife, Vilma Espin, answered all the questions put to them by the North American visitors."

The editorial in Hoy on July 6 is revealing:

"The mobilization of the heroic American Negroes to fight for their rights as citizens, and the voyage of 50 American students to Cuba, is breaking the dollar curtain and destroying the official lies, lies that are disposed to fine them \$5,000 and suffer 5 years in prison (for the illegal trip), demonstrates that even in the fortress of imperialism (the United States) the contradictions among peoples are beginning to explode."

Immediately following the editorial on the American Negroes and students, came the following:

"The letter from the Leftist Front of Liberation of Uruguay to comrade Fidel Castro expressing the unmovable solidarity of the peoples of Latin America toward the Cuban revolution is as unmovable as the solidarity of Cuba toward the Latin American peoples. The OAS with its treaties (accords) is incapable of killing this sentiment, or to impede its expression."

"Our peoples can close the road to the interventionists, the fight of all the patriotic forces, democratic, popular, revolutionaries, socialists . . . all those who refuse to cede to the Yankee foreign ministry as colonies . . . etc."

Apparently linked to all this, OMQ Havana broadcast on July 5 the following:

"There are three student groups participating in a march through the United States asking the Government to evacuate the Guantanamo Base. They agreed yesterday to meet at Griffith Air Force Base. The students met on July 3 in New York and said that their march would end at the Guantanamo Base, despite the fact that the U.S. Government arbitrarily maintains prohibitions against U.S. citizens visiting Cuba."

Again, on July 9, Radio Progreso, Havana, said:

"It was announced in New York that participants of the 'March For Peace' left Rome yesterday en route to Cuba, after having made a final demonstration on American Territory (U.S. base of Biki in Italy) with their final goal Guantanamo Base."

"The group will be joined by 3 others, from Quebec, Canada, and 12 from Cleveland, Ohio, reiterating their decision to continue the peaceful fight for Cuba."

"The members of the group pointed out that 'the fight for peace in the Caribbean is a necessary condition for peace in all of the world.'"

"They will travel through North American territory, from North to South, until they arrive in Florida, where they will arrive at the city Guantanamo, more than 3,500 miles of journey."

They announced they would 'continue making acts of protest against the aggressions of the United States against Cuba,' and are journeying to Guantanamo, 'despite the official Yankee measures that prohibit North Americans to journey to Cuba.'"

(Mr. CRAMER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

MALICIOUS STATEMENT RESENTED

(Mr. TALCOTT (at the request of Mr. SIBAL) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, portions of a statement appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 27, 1963, on page 11195, are seriously erroneous.

An unnamed union leader—after claiming an absence of toilet and hand-washing facilities for migrants—is quoted as saying:

Consumers would gag on their salad if they saw the lack of sanitary conditions under which the products are grown and processed.

I challenge the perpetrator, purveyor, or publisher of the quoted statement to produce any legally or morally acceptable evidence to substantiate any such charge pertaining to the Salinas Valley in California. I believe, and unless factual evidence is produced, I submit that the statement is false—maliciously false.

More quality salad vegetables are grown and processed in the Salinas Valley than in any other place in the world and such conditions do not occur in the Salinas Valley. Any product grown in the Salinas Valley is thoroughly inspected for all imperfections—by State inspectors and by industry self-inspection, for which there is none more strict in the United States.

Moreover, the statement is an unfair and false slur upon the migrant workers. Certainly the publisher of this remark would not want to infer that the personal habits of the domestic migrant worker are inferior to those of the bracero from Mexico.

Would anyone believe that any person—even the most stupid—would make such a derogatory remark about an industry in which he was interested or from which he derived his livelihood. Such a remark, even if well founded, would be no less than treacherous sabotage.

It would seem analogous and just as fair to publish a statement that all domestic grocers, doctors, and restaurateurs in San Antonio had a contagious venereal disease. Such a statement would be rightfully resented by everyone. I resent the statement about the salad vegetable industry.

Also, it occurs to me that if the cause was valid, resort to false statements would not be necessary.

Most importantly, all people—excepting one dishonest ingrate—in every State in our Union can be assured that all vegetables grown in the Salinas Valley of California were and are of high quality, clean and thoroughly inspected.

Any reasonable person should understand what every local governmental official in California well knows; namely, that it is enormously more difficult, ex-

The agencies contend that NASA—the Government's newest glamor agency as far as Congress and the public is concerned—is using higher salaries and promises of promotions to entice the employees.

As a result, some Federal agencies contend that their own vital programs are being hurt. Some of the defense agencies, for example, are unhappy about the situation. They assert that their programs are at least as vital to the national security as NASA's.

The Defense Department is not the only Government establishment unhappy about NASA recruitment of their engineers and scientists. Other Government research and scientific agencies are equally unhappy. There is a definite possibility that President Kennedy will be asked to order a halt on NASA's recruitment of other Government engineers and scientists.

NASA denies the raiding charges. The agency does acknowledge that of the 3,700 scientists and engineers it hired during the last 15 months, about one-third of these came from other Government agencies.

However, NASA officials say that about 60 percent of the engineers and scientists secured from other Federal agencies were not given higher salaries. The other 40 percent did get higher pay grades on joining NASA.

NASA officials acknowledge that many scientists and engineers switched over to their agency in the hope of eventually getting higher pay. This is only reasonable, say NASA officials, since the agency is the fastest growing one in Government and consequently more promotional opportunities will be available.

Officials of other Government agencies contend that NASA recruitment officers stress this fact in persuading engineers and scientists to switch to NASA. NASA is one of the few Government agencies that has no trouble getting all the money it wants from Congress to run its operations.

INTENSIFYING THE FREE WORLD'S ECONOMIC BOYCOTT OF CASTRO'S CUBA

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, during the past several weeks, I have been interested and impressed as have many other Senators by the developing discussions of American policy on Cuba which were touched off by the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] when he recently delivered a most informative speech on Cuba and called for a developing dialog on the subject. And since the executive branch has chosen to remain silent about Cuba and continues its failure to propose constructive Cuban policies I think it highly appropriate that Congress has become a forum for this discussion. I note that more and more Members of the House of Representatives are also devoting their talents to this serious and growing problem.

On the Senate side, the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] and the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] have come forward with stimulating suggestions of their own. The Allott proposal to encourage the establishment of a free provisional government to be offered a home on Cuban soil on Guantanamo base and the Curtis suggestion that we establish a Pacific blockade of Cuba enforced by our Navy and Air Force have evoked spirited and informative discussions among important segments of our national press and each proposal has developed its own pro-

ponents and its opponents. In my opinion, Mr. President, this is all to the good. Challenging and constructive recommendations such as those emanating from the Senator from Colorado and the Senator from Nebraska may not be the final and accepted answer to our continuing do-nothing policy toward Cuba but from the discussions involving these and other proposals it is hoped that an all-American, positive, forward-moving program may be evolved toward Cuba which will force the Russian and Chinese Communists out of Cuba and hurry the downfall of Castro and the establishment of a free and representative democratic government in Cuba.

As I stated on the Senate floor during the colloquies which followed the proposals of Senators ALLOTT and CURTIS, I am not personally wholly satisfied in my own mind that either of them, or both together, provide us with the proper formula for action at this time. I believe we should, for example, fully explore the availability of other Cuban soil—some nearby islands, perhaps—or some other location, other than Guantanamo Bay, for a free provisional Cuban Government, representative of all responsible Cuban factions, and one which our own country could and should then recognize. And instead of the type of Pacific blockade envisioned by Senator CURTIS, I said at the time in the discussion in the Senate—and I rise today to describe more fully what I had in mind—that there is an alternative first step which in my own opinion our country can and should take in the area of utilizing economic pressures to bring Castro to his knees. However, I again salute Senators ALLOTT and CURTIS and all others who are devoting their talents and their thoughts to the imperative need to "get America moving"—to quote an almost forgotten phrase from our recent past—in the direction of doing something more effective about Cuba than merely decrying the existence of the Communist Castro dictatorship on our doorstep and wringing our hands at the unwillingness of the Russians to go home or the reluctance of Castro voluntarily to abdicate. Our recent history with relationship to the Cuban peril is indeed most melancholy and discouraging.

One of the most inadequate and least satisfying aspects of present U.S. policy toward Cuba consists of the half-hearted measures that have been taken toward weakening the economic base of the Castro regime. Granted, there is a virtually complete embargo on United States-Cuba trade that has been in effect since February 1962 and that the countries of Latin America are for the most part imposing sharp curtailments on their own trade in Cuba. But let us take a look at the other measures announced by the administration and see just what effect they have had.

First, under the Foreign Assistance Appropriations Act of 1962, U.S. Congress provided that American aid will be denied to any country whose ships carry arms or strategic materials to Cuba.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the complete text of these congressional prohibitions.

There being no objection, the text was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Public Law 87-872 (76 Stat. 1165), October 23, 1962: Section 107(a). No assistance shall be furnished to any country which sells, furnishes, or permits any ships under its registry to carry to Cuba, so long as it is governed by the Castro regime, under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, any arms, ammunition, implements of war, atomic energy materials, or any articles, materials, or supplies, such as petroleum, transportation materials of strategic value, and items of primary strategic significance used in the production of arms, ammunition, and implements of war, contained on the list maintained by the Administrator pursuant to title I of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951, as amended.

(b) No economic assistance shall be furnished to any country which sells, furnishes, or permits any ships under its registry to carry items of economic assistance to Cuba so long as it is governed by the Castro regime, under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, unless the President determines that the withholding of such assistance would be contrary to the national interest and reports such determination to the Foreign Relations and Appropriations Committees of the Senate and the Foreign Affairs and Appropriations Committees of the House of Representatives. Reports made pursuant to this subsection shall be published in the Federal Register within seven days of submission to the committees and shall contain a statement by the President of the reasons for such determination.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, these provisions are not, however, enforced with regard to NATO-type aid to NATO countries. Hence, this is not as strong as it sounds, since Cuba has been receiving arms from the Communist bloc in Communist bottoms for 3 years now. None come directly from non-Communist countries.

Second, a series of measures was announced last October, just before the discovery of the Soviet missile-launch sites and nuclear weapons in Cuba. It consisted of the following:

First, U.S. ports will be closed to all ships of any nation that permits its vessels to carry military equipment to Cuba.

Second, U.S. ports will be closed to any ship that on a continuous run carries any nonmilitary Communist cargoes to Cuba.

Third, Foreign shipowners whose vessels are engaged in trade between Cuba and the Soviet bloc will be prohibited from carrying U.S. Government-financed cargoes on any of their ships.

Fourth, U.S. flagships of U.S.-owned ships are forbidden to carry goods to and from Cuba.

Mr. President, this series of measures sounded fairly strong, when first enunciated; but, I hasten to add, they were never put into effect. The administration attributed its inaction to the October missiles crisis, the subsequent negotiations over the release of the Bay of Pigs prisoners, and vigorous protests from some of our allies.

Finally, last February the administration issued an order barring U.S. Govern-

July 15

ernment-financed cargoes to foreign ships trading with Cuba. The President directed Federal departments and agencies to deny—"shipments of such cargoes on vessels that have called at a Cuban port since January 1, 1963, unless the owner of such a ship gives satisfactory assurances that no ship under his control will henceforth be employed in the Cuban trade."

Thus, our present policy with respect to discouraging our allies from trading with Castro's Cuba consists of a provision of the Foreign Assistance Appropriations Act of 1962 that is virtually inapplicable and the order denying shipments of U.S. Government-financed cargoes on individual ships that have traded with Cuba since last January 1.

In this connection, I wish to refer to an editorial, published in the New York Times, which states:

The latest step was a request to Britain to prohibit Cuban planes from landing on Grand Cayman Island, which is regarded as a convenient transfer point for Cuban Communists traveling to South American countries.

The editorial also states:

The other measure was a freeze on an estimated \$33 million in deposits (\$20 million held by the Cuban government, and the remainder by Cuban nationals resident in Cuba) accompanied by a ban on U.S. dollar transactions with Cuba.

But neither one of these has any significant impact whatsoever on the economic situation in Cuba. I call to the attention of the Senate this editorial, entitled "'Controls' on Castro," which was published in the New York Times; and I call to the attention of those who read the Record who may not be familiar with the editorial policies of the New York Times the fact that it is a newspaper which supported the election of President Kennedy, has supported his foreign policy, and has fairly consistently supported his attitude toward Cuba; but that was going a step too far in trying to bewilder and confuse the public, so the editorial concludes with the following paragraph:

The notion that Cuba is being subject to total economic isolation may be politically helpful to the administration. But the actual impact of its latest steps is minimal. In fact, they give Castro ammunition on the evils of dollar diplomacy for his agents to spread throughout South America.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire editorial be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times,
July 12, 1963]

CONTROLS ON CASTRO

With considerable fanfare the Kennedy administration has announced two new measures advertised as curbing Cuba's ability to engage in subversive activities. But on examination they are mostly bark and little bite.

The latest step was a request to Britain to prohibit Cuban planes from landing on Grand Cayman Island, which is regarded as a convenient transfer point for Cuban Communists traveling to South American countries. Even if the British agree, Castro's agents would not be confined to Cuba.

This would require a similar ban by all countries bordering the Caribbean. Despite the resolution of the Council of the Organization of American States urging its members "to counter Castro-Communist subversion in the hemisphere," other nations are unlikely to follow the United States in curtailing Cuban flights.

The other measure was a freeze on an estimated \$33 million in deposits (\$20 million held by the Cuban Government and the remainder by Cuban nationals resident in Cuba) accompanied by a ban on United States dollar transactions with Cuba.

There is no way to stop Cuba from financing subversive activities in South America, where controls over currency movements are notoriously lax. Ever since trade relations with the United States were broken off 2 years ago, Cuba has conducted most of its commercial transactions with the West in Canadian dollars, Swiss francs and the British pound, which are fully convertible into dollars. Presumably, they can be equally useful to Cuba's agents.

Nor will Castro be pinched by the freezing of \$20 million in deposits. These funds have been tied up in litigation with American companies whose assets in Cuba have been expropriated, so that they could not be withdrawn in any event. As for the immobilization of deposits held by individuals, it is comparatively small change.

The notion that Cuba is being subject to total economic isolation may be politically helpful to the administration. But the actual impact of its latest steps is minimal. In fact, they give Castro ammunition on the evils of dollar diplomacy for his agents to spread throughout South America.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I am happy to yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. I commend the Senator from South Dakota for his splendid discussion of U.S. policy—or the lack of it—toward the Cuban Government. It is in keeping with the previous discussions in the Congress, which seems to be the only forum in the Government where this subject is being discussed and where constructive steps are being suggested. These are helpful suggestions which could well receive consideration from other quarters in the National Government, although apparently they are not.

In regard to the instance cited by the Senator from South Dakota—the impoundment, a week ago today, of Cuban funds—I ask if it is not true that there are at least three points in regard to the so-called freezing of those funds which render it virtually ineffective.

First, \$13 million of that \$33 million was in private funds which were tied up by litigation of American claimants against Cuban citizens or corporations. Therefore, the freeze order was without any effect whatsoever upon the \$13 million.

Mr. MUNDT. Yes, I understand it was freezing something which was already frozen.

Mr. HRUSKA. Second, part of the \$20 million of the funds for the Castro government itself was to be used to finance Cuba's United Nations activities in this country. When that was discovered, an order to unfreeze that particular portion of the funds was entered, thereby vitiating the order considerably. It is well known in banking circles that this order might be a petty annoyance or disturbance and may even have some small psy-

chological value, but it has no practical effect or impact whatsoever upon the Cuban economic situation.

Is the Senator from South Dakota familiar with that view?

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator from Nebraska is entirely correct.

I am sure it was that aspect of it, among others, which led this pro-Kennedy newspaper—the New York Times—to make the rather cynical remark that this announcement "may be politically helpful to the administration, but the actual impact of its latest steps is minimal," and that it is completely worthless insofar as bringing economic pressure to bear on Cuba is concerned.

Mr. HRUSKA. Similarly the administration's effort to enforce an order having to do with travel to and from Cuba of agents trained there for subversion in other Latin American countries is of little value.

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct.

Mr. HRUSKA. That order was discussed by the Organization of American States; but, although those discussions were approved by the Council of the OAS, four major nations within that association abstained in that vote; namely, Brazil, Haiti, Mexico, and Venezuela. So, for all practical purposes, though that move provides some window dressing and is the basis for a lot of administration publicity to the effect that we are dealing adequately with Cuba, even that resolution was a disappointment.

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct. Four nations abstained from voting; and one nation voted against us—by casting a negative vote.

Mr. HRUSKA. So this attitude in regard to travel by the agents of subversion and the guerrillas trained in Cuba and sent to the Latin American countries has no real deterrent effect; and those movements continue unimpeded, as heretofore, do they not?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes. In connection with the Senator's statement, I call attention to an Associated Press dispatch dated July 11, and published in the Washington Post, under the heading "Red Agent Suspects Fan Out of Cuba." I shall read the first paragraph of the article, as follows:

The State Department reported yesterday that 15 to 20 persons described as "potential subversive agents" flew from Cuba to various Caribbean countries within the last several weeks.

The article relates how they, in turn, were conveyed from there to Latin American countries.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

RED AGENT SUSPECTS FAN OUT OF CUBA

The State Department reported yesterday that 15 to 20 persons described as "potential subversive agents" flew from Cuba to various Caribbean countries within the last several weeks.

Press Officer Richard I. Phillips said the persons, presumably Cubans, were aboard three Russian-made Ilyushin airliners that landed at Grand Cayman Island, a British-owned Caribbean island. He said they then

transferred to non-Cuban commercial flights for other points in the Caribbean, including San Jose, Costa Rica.

He said the State Department had drawn that to the attention of the British. Generally speaking, he said, Britain has joined with the United States in its policy of isolating the Red Castro regime and not allowing such flights.

No response has yet been received from the British Government, he added.

State Department authorities said that, although Costa Rica has broken off diplomatic relations with the Havana regime and has joined in the American Republics' effort to isolate Cuba, officials at the San Jose airport apparently were taken by surprise at the arrival of the passengers from Cuba and allowed their entry into Costa Rica in normal fashion for airline passengers.

What other Caribbean points the passengers went to was not stated.

In Havana, meanwhile, Cuban newspapers reported for the first time yesterday that Washington had frozen Cuban assets in the United States and taken other measures to clamp on a financial squeeze.

The newspaper El Mundo said:

"Of course this measure does not affect the Cuban Government's available dollar reserves for its dealings with other countries because in these transactions American banks or similar organizations are not involved. These reserves are not deposited in any of them."

[In another development, the Soviet Union ratified a loan agreement giving Cuba long-term credit on favorable terms to "cover the excess of Soviet goods deliveries over Cuban deliveries to the U.S.S.R.," the United Press reported from Moscow.

A brief announcement Tuesday by Tass said the Soviet credit "will strengthen the Cuban economy, help the Cuban population with consumer goods." Tass said the arrangement was concluded last February, but gave no further details.]

Mr. HRUSKA. I thank the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I appreciate the contributions the Senator from Nebraska has made.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield to me?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Utah, who has made a great study of this entire Cuban problem, and heretofore has expressed himself very lucidly and effectively on it.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I have been interested in this colloquy between the Senator from South Dakota and the Senator from Nebraska.

It has developed that out of the \$30 million, which presumably has been frozen, probably only half of that amount was in fact frozen. \$13 million was already frozen. An unnamed amount was unfrozen—let us say half of it, or \$15 million.

Does the Senator from South Dakota remember how much good American merchandise we sent to Cuba as a ransom for the Bay of Pigs prisoners?

Mr. MUNDT. I do not carry the amount in my mind, but it was much larger than either the \$15 million or the \$30 million.

Mr. BENNETT. My memory is that it was approximately \$53 million.

Mr. MUNDT. I believe it was in that neighborhood.

Mr. BENNETT. Cannot Castro laugh up his sleeve at us when we are stupid

enough to think that we are making progress by freezing \$15 million, and then hand him \$53 million of new wealth, new and usable merchandise in exchange for those prisoners—one of the most effective bits of international blackmail in history?

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator makes a sound observation. While all of us are pleased at any little token step whatsoever against Castro, and agree it was perfectly proper for the administration to have taken those steps, but to balloon them up, to headline them, and to make a special announcement about them in order to deceive the people back home into believing we are doing something effective was too much for the New York Times to stomach. For that reason the editorial was written.

The whole program of the administration is at best a half-hearted and less than a half way program. It is even more half-hearted than I said it was in my colloquy the other day with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], when he was delivering his magnificent address. At that time I declared that we are telling a shipping company, in effect, "All we require of you is that your ships A, B, and C which trade with Cuban ports, shall not enter our ports; but you may bring into our ports any other ships you operate."

Actually, we are saying, "Ships A, B, and C may enter our ports and carry cargo to Cuba so long as that cargo is not financed by the U.S. Government."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point in my remarks the most recent report of the Maritime Administration listing free world, Yugoslav, and Polish flag vessels arriving in Cuba since January 1, 1963.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE MARITIME ADMINISTRATION REPORT NO. 9

LIST OF FREE WORLD AND POLISH FLAG VESSELS ARRIVING IN CUBA SINCE JANUARY 1, 1963

Section 1. Pursuant to the National Security Action Memorandum No. 220, dated February 5, 1963, addressed to the Secretary of State; the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Commerce; the Administrator, Agency for International Development, and the Administrator, General Services Administration, concerning U.S. Government shipments by foreign-flag vessels in the Cuban trade, the Maritime Administration is making available to the appropriate departments the following list of vessels which have arrived in Cuba since January 1, 1963, based on information received through May 31, 1963, exclusive of those vessels that called at Cuba on U.S. Government-approved noncommercial voyages and those listed in section 2:

Flag of registry, name of ship

	Gross tonnage
Total—all flags (97) ships	807,581
British (33 ships)	326,443
Ardgem	6,981
Ardmore	4,664
Ardrowan	7,300
Arlington Court	9,662
Athelcrown (tanker)	11,149
Athelduke (tanker)	9,089
Athelmere (tanker)	7,524

Flag of registry, name of ship—Continued

	Gross tonnage
British—Continued	
Athelmonarch (tanker)	11,182
Athelsultan (tanker)	9,149
Avisfaith	7,868
Chipbee ¹	7,271
Fir Hill	7,119
Hazelmoor	7,907
Ho Fung	7,121
Ivy Fair ¹	7,201
Linkmoor	8,236
London Confidence (tanker)	21,699
London Independence (tanker)	22,643
London Majesty (tanker)	12,132
London Pride (tanker)	10,776
London Splendour (tanker)	16,195
London Victory (tanker)	12,132
Lord Gladstone	11,299
Maratha Enterprise	1,166
Overseas Explorer (tanker)	16,267
Overseas Pioneer (tanker)	16,267
Pampas	7,589
Shienfoon	7,127
Tulse Hill	7,120
Vercharmian	7,265
West Breeze ¹	8,718
Yungfutary	5,388
Zela M ¹	7,237
Greek (23 ships)	191,064
Alderbaran (tanker)	12,897
Americana	7,104
Apollon	9,744
Capetan Petros	7,291
Despolina ¹	5,006
Embassy	8,418
Galini	7,266
Gloria	7,128
Hydraios III ¹	5,239
King Theseus	9,153
Kyra Hariklia	6,888
Maria Santa	7,217
Mastro-Stellos II	7,282
North Empress	10,904
Pamit	8,929
Pantanassa	7,131
Penelope	6,712
Perseus (tanker)	15,852
Redestos	5,911
Selrios	7,239
Sirius (tanker)	16,241
Styllanos N. Vlassopoulos	7,244
Western Trader ¹	9,268
Lebanese (14 ships)	96,633
Akamas	7,285
Aiolos II	7,256
Carnation ¹	4,884
Giorgos Tsakiroglou	7,240
Ilena	5,925
Malou	7,145
Mantric	7,255
Mousse	6,984
Noelle	7,251
Noemi	7,070
Olga	7,199
Parmarina	6,721
Razani ¹	7,263
St. Nicolas	7,165
Italian (7 ships)	53,415
Achille	6,950
Annalisa ¹	2,479
Arenella ¹	7,183
Cannaregio	7,184
Linda Giovanna (tanker)	9,985
Nazareno ¹	7,173
San Nicola (tanker)	12,461
Norwegian (5 ships)	45,595
Benny Viking	3,857
Kongsgaard (tanker)	19,999

Footnote at end of table.

Flag of registry, name of ship—Continued

	Gross tonnage
Norwegian—Continued	
Ole Bratt	5,252
Polyclipper (tanker)	11,737
Tine	4,750
Polish (5 ships)	30,274
Baltyk	6,963
Bialystok	7,173
Bytom	5,967
Chopin	6,987
Plast	3,184
Yugoslav (4 ships)	28,041
Bar	7,233
Cavtat	7,266
Dugi Otok	6,997
Trebanjica	7,145
Spanish (2 ships)	4,565
Castillo Ampudia	3,666
Sierra Madre	999
West German (1 ship): Adolf Leonhardt	7,066
Japanese (1 ship): Melschun Maru	8,647
Moroccan (1 ship): Toubkal	8,748
Swedish (1 ship): Dagmar	6,490

¹ Added to report No. 8 appearing in the Federal Register, issue of May 25, 1963.

Sec. 2. In accordance with the provisions of National Security Action Memorandum No. 220 of February 5, 1963, the following vessels which called at Cuba after January 1, 1963 have reacquired eligibility to carry United States Government-financed cargoes from the United States by virtue of the persons who control the vessels having given satisfactory certification and assurance that no ships under their control will, thenceforth, be employed in the Cuba trade so long as it remains the policy of the United States Government to discourage such trade:

a. Since last report.

	Gross tonnage
Danish (1 ship) Himmerland	8,774

b. Previous reports.

Flag of Registry	Number of ships
British	1

Sec. 3. The ships listed in Sections 1 and 2 have made the following number of trips to Cuba in 1963, based on information received through May 31, 1963:

Flag of registry	Number of trips				
	January	February	March	April	May
British (43)	5	8	8	16	6
Greek (30)	4	6	8	8	4
Lebanese (14)	1		2	8	3
Norwegian (7)		2	4		1
Italian (8)	1	1	1	2	3
Yugoslav (4)		2	1	1	
Spanish (2)			2		
Danish (1)			1		
German (West) (1)					1
Japanese (1)	1				
Moroccan (1)			1		
Swedish (1)				1	
Total (113)	12	19	28	26	18
Polish (7)	2	1	1	2	1

NOTE.—Trip totals in this section exceed ship totals in secs. 1 and 2 because some of the ships made more than 1 trip to Cuba.

DONALD W. ALEXANDER,
Maritime Administrator.

Mr. MUNDT. It is about time for Senators and the country generally to know specifically what we are talking about in connection with the extensive trade now being conducted with Cuba. The reports list the names of the ships, the tonnage, the dates, and the entire factual material, so that the people will realize that we are are practically doing nothing whatsoever at the moment even to make trade with Cuba difficult, to say nothing about trying to make it impossible.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me briefly?

Mr. MUNDT. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. I am happy that the Senator is putting the entire table into the Record, but I believe it would be helpful at this time if he would mention the totals involved. My recollection of the figures is that they are most astounding. I shall have something to say about the Senator's remarks later. But some of the countries listed show a grand total amount which is beyond one's belief.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator is entirely correct about the amounts. Actually I have not added the total number of gross tons. However, in the period covered by the report there has been a total of 97 ships carrying a gross tonnage of 807,581 tons. The names of the ships are listed. The countries are also listed. I am sure that many Senators, when they read the list of ships, will share with me disappointment when they find that the biggest offenders in this regard and the biggest traffickers in blood money are our good friends in the British Isles—Great Britain.

Mr. President, this indicates that the administration's half-hearted measure has had no visible effect. The number of trips made by free world ships to Cuba actually was lower in January, 1 month before the administration's order went into effect, than in any month since then through May.

So if the order did anything, it seemed to encourage people to trade with Cuba instead of to discourage them.

Other sources indicate that shipping from some of our European allies to Cuba may be even greater than U.S. Government reports show. I call the attention of Senators to a recent report issued by "Revolutionary Unity," a Cuban organization in Miami claiming excellent sources of information from inside Cuba.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record at this point in my remarks a tabulation of free world shipping with Cuba prepared by this organization, which also breaks it down by months, countries, and by offenders.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Free world ships entering Cuban ports

	April 1963	March 1963	February 1963	January 1963	December 1962	November 1962	Total
United Kingdom	24	7	3	7	4	3	48
Lebanon	22	0	0	1	4	0	27
Greece	14	5	5	3	5	3	35
Panama	1	0	1	1	1	0	4
France	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Sweden	1	0	1	2	3	4	11
Italy	3	1	3	2	1	1	11
Morocco	1	0	0	1	0	0	2
Denmark	1	0	0	0	0	1	2
Norway	3	1	2	0	4	0	10
Holland	0	0	1	0	1	1	3
Spain	0	2	0	0	1	0	3
Turkey	0	0	0	0	3	2	5
West Germany	0	0	0	0	1	1	2
Total	70	16	16	18	27	16	163

Mr. MUNDT. Regardless of source, the available information suggests that the measure announced last Friday is not working effectively. In fact, I submit that it is doubtful whether it is working at all. Meanwhile, the volume of Soviet-bloc shipping to Cuba seems to be rising.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to insert in the Record at this point in my remarks a brief statement made in the House of Representatives on June 11 by the gentleman from Florida, Representative ROGERS, dealing with this specific point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

RUSSIANS INCREASE SHIPS TO CUBA

Source: CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 11, 1963, pp. 10047-10048.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I have received information from various U.S. Government sources which shows that the Russians have increased the number of ships supplying Castro's island in recent weeks.

It may be too early to determine the significance of this increase, but stepped up shipping was an early sign of the Soviet military buildup of Cuba last summer. I strongly urge that U.S. surveillance of Cuba be intensified to insure that our intelligence community can provide reliable and accurate data for U.S. policymakers.

During the month of May, 37 Soviet ships, along with 9 Soviet-bloc ships, called in Cuba. April shipping figures show 27 Soviet vessels, along with 7 Soviet-bloc ships. Total Iron Curtain shipping to Cuba for the first 6 months of 1963 numbers 165 ships, 52 of which were tankers.

Detailed Russian shipping figures for 1963 are as follows:

Month	Total	Soviet-flag ships	Bloc-flag ships	Tankers
January	41	35	6	10
February	38	34	4	10
March	35	32	3	10
April	34	27	7	10
May	46	37	9	12
To date	194	165	29	52

However, the shocking fact is that one out of every three ships supplying Castro's island is from the free world.

Since January 1963, 89 allied ships have made trips to Cuba, and 20 of these vessels

were tankers. This shipping would have been considerably reduced if the U.S. Government had implemented my proposal to close U.S. ports to nations which allow their flags to be used in sea trade with Cuba. However, such action is warranted particularly now in view of this new development.

The British are the main offenders. Since January of this year there have been 33 British ships which have called in Cuba. The British would think twice about shipping to Castro if we banned the *Queen Mary* from New York Harbor.

Mr. MUNDT. I also ask that the news stories on this subject appearing in the *Baltimore Sun* on June 21 and June 25, this year, be printed in the *RECORD* at this point.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

[From the *Baltimore Sun*, June 21, 1963]

CUBA TRADE RISE ALARMING TO UNITED STATES

WASHINGTON, June 20.—Administration officials privately expressed concern today about the increase in Western shipping to Cuba.

This was learned as the Maritime Administration released the names of 21 ships added to the U.S. blacklist for trading with Cuba.

Although the 21 compose the largest list yet released by the Government agency since the blacklist was put into effect as of January 1, additional vessels bound for Cuba were noted in *Lloyd's Shipping Index*, which records ship movements all over the world.

BRITISH SHIPS BLAMED

State Department and White House officials pinpointed British and Greek-owned ships as playing a major role among the vessels trading with the Communist dominated island.

A high official remarked:

"The British and Greek Governments could certainly do more than they are doing about their ships going to Cuba. So far they have done nothing."

Although the Greek Government has made three major pronouncements since the Cuban crisis last fall about its ships not going to Cuba, a number of Greek-flag as well as Greek-owned vessels, show up on every list.

The newest group includes seven Greek and five Lebanese ships, most of which are owned by Greeks. Only 4 British ships were in this count, bringing the British total up to 37 ships making 47 trips since January 1.

Thirty Greek-flag ships have made 37 trips and 19 Lebanese ships have made 19 trips.

The blacklist now contains the names of 118 Western and Polish ships making 132 trips since January 1, the arbitrary cutoff date.

PLEDGE IS NEEDED

The vessels are not allowed to pick up U.S. Government cargoes in U.S. ports as their punishment for going to Cuba. However, any owner can remove his vessel from the blacklist by promising it will not call at Cuba again.

Many American shipping executives and maritime labor unions were critical when the single restriction against Cuban-trading ships was announced in February. They predicted then that it was not strong enough to deter Western shipowners from diverting their vessels from this trade which has become more profitable in recent months.

The International Longshoremen's Association (AFL-CIO) takes more credit than the Government for cutting off a large portion of Cuban-trading ships by refusing to work any cargoes on them or any ships of any shipowner going to Cuba.

[From the *Baltimore Sun*, June 25, 1963]

MORE SHIPS GO TO CUBA

(By Helen Delich Bentley)

WASHINGTON, June 24.—Havana radio today confirmed what administration officials have been saying quietly with concern—that free world shipping to Cuba is on the increase.

The Communist radio broadcast quoted an editorial of the Havana newspaper *Hoy* saying, "Each new boat which is added to this list is a defeat for the imperialists since it signifies no more and no less than the addition of a boat and a company and a capitalist country which has ignored the Yankee threats, has disobeyed the orders, has disregarded the persuasions, and the demands."

ADDITIONS TO BLACKLIST

Last Thursday the largest single group of free world ships calling at Cuba was announced by the U.S. Government and added to the blacklist.

That list now numbers 118 vessels which are not privileged to transport U.S. Government-financed cargoes out of U.S. ports. They can pick up such cargoes in foreign ports and carry them to another foreign port.

The blacklist contains the names of those ships which have called at Cuba since January 1.

PROOF OF STUPIDITY

"The fact that they already have had to inscribe 118 boats on the blacklist is a proof of the stupidity of this policy, of its weakness, of its inevitable failure," *Hoy* said.

The number of vessels visiting Cuba has been increased since Premier Fidel Castro visited Russia, the newspaper stated.

"The world sees that the world balance of forces and the unity of Cuba with the Socialist world augur the complete failure of the U.S. policy aggression," it added.

Early last week, administration officials had said in private circles that they were disturbed by the rise in free world shipping to Cuba.

NEW SUGAR CROP NOTED

They were inclined to attribute it to the present sugar crop, for which the Communists are willing to pay premium freight rates to get the crop moving.

U.S. shipping sources do not feel the single restriction which the Government has imposed upon free world ships calling at Cuba is sufficient to stop shipowners from use of their vessels in that trade.

The Government restriction covers only the ship involved.

DOUBTED WHEN IMPOSED

When it was announced February 6, retroactive to ships of January 1, there was criticism in this country that it would not do the job. But Government officials said it would be sufficient, noting such trading to Cuba had dropped sharply from October when the initial warning was issued.

The International Longshoremen's Association (AFL-CIO) claims that its own ban against both ships and shipowners calling at Cuba since November 8 has done more to cut down the calls than the Government's restriction.

An ILA spokesman said the union still receives two or three calls daily from ship charterers and brokers clearing a vessel before it is chartered to a new operator.

Mr. MUNDT. Here, too, we get out of the realm of generalities and speculation and come down to the actual names of the offenders, the names of the ships, and the amounts of merchandise being transported.

Why should the present measure work, Mr. President? What incentive is there for some of our allies to curtail their

trade with Cuba? Certainly none can be found in U.S. policy on Cuba.

The fact of the matter is that the United States has not demonstrated that it really means business when it says that Communist power in this hemisphere is intolerable, non-negotiable, and must be eliminated.

Certainly the Bay of Pigs debacle was not such a demonstration. Surely, the aftermath of the missile crisis of last fall as well as the weeks preceding it convinced nobody that we really regard Cuba as an urgent threat to the security of this hemisphere that must be dealt with accordingly. And certainly diplomatic representations to our allies to curtail their trade with Cuba are meaningless in the face of this record and alongside the puny measure I described earlier.

Before we can expect other free nations to go along with our desire to intensify the boycott of Castro's Cuba, we must demonstrate that we really are serious and mean business.

Having displayed this intention clearly for all the world to see, we can then go to our allies in Europe and elsewhere and lay it on the line: We can make it clear that we will close U.S. ports to all vessels of any country permitting trade with Cuba—not just to those specific vessels engaged in the trade. And we can warn that unwillingness to heed our requests will result in the suspension or sharp curtailment of U.S. Government aid programs until a change of attitude is manifested.

I realize, Mr. President, that these are stringent measures not designed to enhance our popularity abroad, but stringent measures may be required to communicate the seriousness of our intent to other nations and to achieve our objectives with respect to the Castro-Communist threat in this hemisphere.

I do not claim original authorship of the proposals I am making for intensifying the economic boycott of Castro's Cuba. I am sure others have discussed them and advocated all or part of them at different times. However, I first advocated these proposals shortly after the President's speech of last October 22, and I have reiterated them on frequent occasions since. I think it is now time to bring them formally to the attention of the Senate and the administration as I am doing here today.

Let me repeat, Mr. President: Our present economic sanctions against the Castro regime are halfhearted, they have had no visible effect, and consequently more stringent measures are required. A number of constructive suggestions for peaceful but positive actions have been made on the Senate floor these past few weeks.

These measures effectively refute and answer the oft repeated question asked by the White House whenever it is urged to face up to the growing perils of communism in Cuba. The White House then seeks to allay or divert criticism of its "see no evil; hear no evil; speak no evil" policy of vacillation by asking, "Well, what do you propose—that we go to war to free Cuba?"

Mr. President, that Yankee habit of seeking to answer a question by merely

asking another may have some merit elsewhere but it has neither merit nor validity in a discussion of our Cuban policy or lack of Cuban policy.

Certainly nobody in the Senate has remotely suggested that we go to war to free Cuba, but a growing chorus of unhappy Senators reflecting a growing number of impatient and disillusioned Americans, have suggested and are suggesting constructive steps far short of war which can hasten the downfall of Castro and speed the day when Cuba will again be liberated and administered by freedom-loving Cubans.

It becomes increasingly clear day by day, Mr. President, that to continue to do nothing is the most dangerous policy of all. We can neither wish away the problem of communism and Castroism in Cuba nor close our eyes in the expectation that when we open them the problem will have evaporated. Each passing day that we ignore its existence increases the dangers of its presence and the difficulties involved in its elimination.

Mr. President, the action program, the positive policies which I propose and strongly recommend here this afternoon have a number of attractive and appealing virtues. I enumerate some specifically:

First. Nobody can successfully argue that this program is an act of war. By our sovereign right to control our own trade, our own harbors, and our own foreign aid programs we simply reenforce our appeals to others that they join us in helping us to help them to stay free and to remain secure and at peace.

Second. To the degree that these economic pressures are applied to Cuba—and the degree of success and cooperation that is attained will depend upon the vigor with which our administration would implement this program—we shall be undermining Castro-communism in Cuba and weakening his capacity to do injury elsewhere.

Third. By urging all members of the Organization of American States and of NATO, together with the governments of free nations everywhere, to cooperate in this voluntary but comparatively universal withholding of all commercial transactions and all free shipping from Cuba, we shall make her dependent for outside aid upon the comparatively weak and austere capacities of the Communist countries to provide such assistance. Cubans generally will then realize the meager degree to which they can be benefitted by the Communist cohorts of their own treacherous leader.

Fourth. By exercising the great prestige of our American leadership potential in winning free nations to the support of this organized program of economic pressures we shall gain experience with our friends and allies in "working in harness together" in the interests of the mutual security and advancement of all free peoples. From these experiences in effective teamwork and cooperation it would be hoped the same countries under American leadership and inspiration then might come to take other collective and cooperative actions together in the United Nations and elsewhere. Nothing succeeds like success, and suc-

cessful experiences in working together should lead to a continuation and expansion of these experiences.

Fifth. Since it is too much to be hoped that all free nations and their respective Governments will cooperate in such a program of economic pressures and abstention from economic relations with Cuba, a final and important dividend for freedom would flow from an American-inspired effort of this type. We would, to put it colloquially, be "dividing the men from the boys." We would learn from our efforts exactly which countries and which governments really want to support collective security and human freedom and which are merely interested in procuring for themselves the maximum of American aid and free world support in a selfish attempt to aggrandize themselves, to keep themselves in power, and to practice a program of "global panhandling" by which they seek for themselves the largest possible handouts from both the Communist camp and the free world. In fact, if this effort did nothing else than to establish for all to see and understand a star-studded rollcall of the countries who really mean business in the global effort to preserve peace and freedom against Godless, aggressive communism it would produce a standout result well worth all the effort devoted to it.

Mr. President, let me repeat that what I propose requires nothing more than political leadership and moral courage. Specifically I propose four points:

First. Issue a Presidential statement—today, if possible; tomorrow, if necessary; but no later than this week—that henceforth commerce in American ports will be denied to the ships of any country which permits its merchant vessels to engage in trade of any kind—except only medical supplies—to Castro's Cuba.

Second. Present to the Organization of American States and to our NATO allies an official request that each of these friendly countries adopt a similar policy and that they, like we, abstain from shipping to or buying supplies of any kind from Castro's Cuba.

Third. That through appropriate diplomatic channels we present the same requests individually and separately to every country outside the domination of the Communists.

Fourth. That we announce as official American policy the determination to free the Western Hemisphere from Communist-dominated governments inasmuch as this violates at least the spirit and perhaps the letter of our hallowed Monroe Doctrine, and that in our desire to utilize all peaceful means at our control to attain this objective our foreign aid and military assistance programs henceforth must be tailored and adjusted to provide maximum assistance to those who are willing to aid us with our own immediate problem of ridding the Western Hemisphere of Castro's Communist regime and any other Communist dictator who might succeed in grabbing power by means other than those of free, orderly, and honest elections.

Mr. President, in my opinion we need go no further in announcing an Ameri-

can policy of determination and positive action at this time. Perhaps we should move more precipitately and perhaps we should proceed with more direct action—undoubtedly we should take additional steps—but it is my conviction that a program developed along the general lines of my proposal will achieve the desired results and will, likewise, procure for us some highly important and significant collateral dividends and benefits.

Certainly, we should do no less than what I have today proposed. To do less will be to continue to do nothing. Unless we have no faith in our own capacity to lead; or unless we lack confidence in our American ability to sell an idea, which is basically sound and in the interest of freedom loving people everywhere; or unless we are in some way committed by agreements and exchanges of correspondence the contents of which are now unknown, to continue a program of appeasing Castro and doing nothing to help liberate Communist Cuba, I suggest this program as a bare minimum of what is required to recapture our self-respect, to recapture our posture of world leadership, and to recapture the security of the Western Hemisphere and perhaps the world from the growing menace of an unchecked Communist threat thumbing its Red nose at the greatest and the strongest power the world has ever seen.

Today Castro's associates in the drive to communize Latin America and to imperil freedom in the Western Hemisphere have succeeded in creating trouble which is breaking out all over. We witness it today in British Guiana. A few days ago it was in Venezuela. Tomorrow we may expect to see it evidenced in other places creating new provocations and dangers. Each news dispatch from Haiti is fearfully scanned lest it reveal that the Communists from Cuba and their Russian masters have established themselves in that unhappy country, whose dictator flouts the authority of all his neighbors and maintains himself illegally in power by military right.

I invite the attention of Senators and others who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to a most significant full length article which appeared in the June 29-July 6 issue of the Saturday Evening Post. I quote from page 20 of an article entitled "How the Communists Plan To Win Latin America." It is written by Richard Armstrong. I suggest that those who have available the issue of the Saturday Evening Post to which I have alluded, for June 29-July 6, turn to page 20 and read the article in full. I quote one significant statement:

Why has Latin America, so long ignored, become so important a battlefield in the cold war?

The most immediate reason, of course, is Cuba. "The Communists were amazed there", said a former Party member. "They had always assumed that you meant what you said and implied—in the Monroe Doctrine, in the Rio treaty of 1947, and in the Caracas treaty of 1954—that you would not permit an alien dictatorship in the Western Hemisphere. Then came Cuba?"

A prominent U.S. diplomat adds, "The Communists have been working in Latin America for 40 years, but they were always

sabotaged by a certain lethargy, an inner disbelief in success. Cuba says every day that it can happen here. Encouraged by this success, the Communists have launched their first really comprehensive campaign to capture Latin America. Their spirits and their hopes are high.

While we spend billions of dollars abroad to oppose communism and while Americans are dying in far off Asia to support the cause of freedom, we sit in chains and do nothing to protect our home base through moving to reduce the power and repel the programs of communism in Cuba, which is indeed the Achilles heel in our entire program of national defense and world cooperation.

Let us delay no longer in demonstrating the leadership expected of America. Let us evolve a pattern of action against this Communist cancer on our doorstep which will match our brave words about communism elsewhere and which will give meaning and significance to our pretty phrases about the protection and the promotion of freedom throughout the world.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I am most happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Colorado, who has made so many constructive suggestions in this field and who has devoted so much careful study to this growing problem.

Mr. ALLOTT. I am extremely interested in the overall approach that the distinguished Senator from South Dakota has made to this problem. Again and again he has pointed out facts which almost every American knows—what is going on in Venezuela, what is going on in other Latin American countries, and what is going on within Cuba. He has also pointed out—and this is a significant contribution—that there are many ways by which we could stop or throw a block into the development of communism out of Cuba and into Latin America—not only the blockade idea, or closing our ports. He has suggested that we might use our mutual aid for this purpose. I am glad to hear him bring that suggestion up, because I have long felt that aid to other countries should not be a gratuity that we throw around like a drunken man throws money around on Saturday night, but, rather, that our mutual aid should be utilized for one purpose only, and that is for strengthening and bolstering the international foreign policies of this Government.

We know what is going on. In the few weeks since I made my proposal on the floor of the Senate, on June 17—a proposal, incidentally, which was not reported in one of the local newspapers, and which received only a brief notice in another, and then was withdrawn after the first edition—hundreds of letters have come into my office, and they continue to come in an ever increasing and strengthening volume, from South America, saying, "When is America going to wake up and do something about the situation in Europe?"

The point the Senator has made is one of the strongest that can be made. How can we expect those who want free government in other Latin American

countries to have their hand supported when we are absolutely ineffective in doing anything with Cuba? The fact is that every day we permit Cuba to exist as she does—and the Senator has pointed this out so well—we provide moral support to the Communist activities in South America.

Mr. MUNDT. Yes; and we discourage our Latin American friends who might like to join us in a strong effort against communism, and particularly against communism in Cuba. We discourage them by our inertia.

Mr. ALLOTT. I intend to speak in greater detail on one of the points the Senator has made, as a result of some of the thoughts the distinguished Senator from South Dakota has provoked. It is time for Americans to shake their heads and say, "What did Khrushchev want in Cuba?"

It is almost 9 months after the 22d of October, 1962. If any person in this world intended to establish a Communist base in Cuba for the subversion of Latin America, the one thing he would want would be manpower. Whether or not the Communists had large missiles in Cuba, I do not know. Two or three years ago, in 1960, we heard about the missile gap as between the United States and the Soviets. The United States was supposed to be hopelessly inferior. If that was the case, the administration told us, or at least the one who became the head in this country told us, that Russia had all the missiles she needed to destroy America.

Then we were told that the Soviets were putting missiles into Cuba. What purpose would that serve? The answer is, no purpose. Perhaps the whole missile story was a red herring. Perhaps they put blank cylindrical tubes on concrete platforms, to look like missile weapons. Whether or not they were real did not matter. The fact is that the biggest red herring was drawn across our path, and we followed it. When it was over, Khrushchev had at least 17,000 men there in October 1962. Therefore, while we were concerned with what we thought were missiles, he had established an entrenched Communist dictatorship government—not a Cuban Communist government, but a Russian Communist government in Cuba, which is one of the worst kinds of government that could be found anywhere in the world today—and that includes Hungary, Bulgaria, Romania, Poland, and the rest of them.

Mr. MUNDT. And he exacted from our President a promise that he would not promote, and perhaps not permit, an attack against Communist Cuba.

Mr. ALLOTT. That is correct. That is where I think the red herring was. While he was doing that he was doing the things he always wanted to do, and it was necessary for the administration to take this step. That was the Communist red herring; and we completely lost our way.

I thank the Senator for his very great contribution. I hope we shall continue to discuss the subject, and I hope he will continue his contribution, because it will help in forcing a definite policy toward Cuba which will help kill communism in Latin America.

Mr. MUNDT. I appreciate what the Senator has said. We hear indirectly about secret correspondence, which we read about in the newspapers, including a letter a week being exchanged between President Kennedy and Mr. Khrushchev. I am afraid this is a sort of put-and-take correspondence, whereby President Kennedy puts and Mr. Khrushchev takes, so far as Cuba is concerned, because there has surely not been an inch of progress from our standpoint, in the strengthening of our position in Cuba, since the letters began. I hope the President will soon take America into his confidence and let us know what this correspondence is about, and whether we are getting any quid pro quo in any concessions that may be involved in the letters.

Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from South Dakota for his speech today. The assembling of the material he used took a great deal of time and effort. The results are startling with respect to what is happening in the buildup and in the growth of the Communist camp on our doorstep in Cuba.

As one humble American citizen, I am deeply indebted to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, to the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], and to the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] for their remarks and their contributions with regard to the Cuban situation. These distinguished Members of the Senate have probed the subject. They have made suggestions. They have done what should be done by our entire Government.

I am greatly alarmed about our country. I fear that the Republic we love, the Republic with prestige and power and opportunity and tranquility, is being eroded while the heads of our Government are chasing rainbows on foreign continents and making proposals in this country to buy the people's votes, and while other things upon which our permanent status and development depend are being neglected. I refer to our fight against communism, and I refer to the great necessity of preventing the financial collapse of our country.

The Cuban problem cannot be swept under the rug. The Cuban problem cannot be solved by bringing out the flag and using it as a political instrument biennially just before election time.

Mr. MUNDT. In other words, the Senator does not believe that it can be deferred until October 1964?

Mr. CURTIS. No.

Mr. MUNDT. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. CURTIS. It cannot. The whole free world was heartened by what appeared to be the start of positive action in October, 1962. It united the country. It united our allies. It united the freedom-loving people of the Western Hemisphere. It united the voters of the country.

Mr. MUNDT. And it united the two parties.

Mr. CURTIS. Yes.

Mr. MUNDT. I do not know of one Republican Representative or Senator who was against it. We all joined as Americans in an attempt to do some-

thing. We were all disillusioned shortly after the election, when nothing was done, except to retreat.

Mr. CURTIS. This great problem, involving human liberty, involving lives, involving people who are living in slavery, and involving the security of this country, cannot be brushed aside or held back as a "gimmick," to be used politically in October, 1964. I hope the distinguished Senator from South Dakota and other Senators whom I have mentioned, and many other Senators, will speak again and again on this subject. After all, in the last analysis, the people will determine this question. It has been my observation that on most crucial issues the people are far ahead of Washington. The Senator has given all of us documented facts. I hope it will be but the beginning of his efforts along this line.

We are not suggesting that any particular individual's idea be adopted without question. We are suggesting that nothing be done which threatens to make us a fourth rate nation, but that every fact be utilized and pursued in the way it should be utilized and pursued. I again congratulate the distinguished Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. I deeply appreciate the expression of my distinguished colleague from Nebraska. I realize the great amount of work and study he has devoted to this subject and his own fine contribution to the discussion of this subject. We do not dare delay making badly needed decisions on Cuba. After several weeks of study of this subject, with specific facts concerning the economic situation, and the list of ships that were serving Cuba providing grist for the mills, so that we could bring into focus some plans and programs, I have purposely reduced all these to what I consider to be the bare minimal effort to start something effective operating against Cuba without a chance of war, or the breaking of any international treaty, but merely by exercising our prerogative as a sovereign Nation to control our own ships and our own aid program, and to try to flex the muscles of American leadership; and also to discover where we have friends, who they are, who will stand up, who will crawl away, and who stands like a great Shylock, trying to pluck as many shekels as he can, both from the Communists and from the United States.

It is about time to get some sense and rationale into our American foreign policy. A good place to start is 90 miles away with communism in Cuba.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. BENNETT. The Senator from Utah has been sitting here, listening to what the Senator from South Dakota has had to say, and to the comments which have been made by several of our colleagues in the Senate. There have come back into my mind some lines written by the English poet Pope. I am wondering if we are not beginning to prove, in our relationship with Cuba, what Pope said. He was talking about vice, but what he said is true of any other evil thing. He said:

Vice is a monster of so frightful mien,
As to be hated needs but to be seen;
Yet seen too oft, familiar with her face,
We first endure, then pity, then embrace.

The longer we wait before we do anything about Cuba, the more American people there will be who will say, "Oh well, we have gotten along all these years and have not had any trouble. Perhaps we had better accept the situation and go on from there."

I am a little afraid that this is already happening. Articles dealing with Cuba are disappearing from the front pages of our newspapers. We have many more problems to consider, and these have pushed Cuba from the front pages of the newspapers. We are in danger of forgetting the Cuban problem.

When we raise it, as the Senator has raised it today, we are told by the administration, "Do not bother about it. The proposals you make are not practical. We are aware of the problem."

However, every week and every month that goes by customs are preparing us to assume that Cuba is going to be Communist forever.

We lapse into a kind of apathy. We say that this is the status quo. It becomes more and more difficult to develop either a program or the strength to support it. I am very much afraid that if the American people do not nudge the administration soon into beginning the necessary steps of action, we shall reach the point of pity and then embrace. We will say, "This is the way it has been done for so long; it is now the pattern of the future."

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator from Utah has made a most interesting observation, I hope not a prophetic one, but certainly within the realm of possibility. Even though Americans, firmly imbedded as we are in freedom may never embrace voluntarily a situation such as exists in Cuba, there is certainly grave danger that the rest of the world may, as illustrated by the vote the other day, when there were four abstentions and one adverse vote on a vote from Latin American republics on a perfectly puerile, innocuous, inconsequential resolution. I suspect that one reason why we lost was that any rational man could say, "Why do this? Why antagonize Castro on this point? Why slap him in the face? This is a completely ineffective procedure."

The leaders of the Latin American Republics are conversant with the teaching that one never strikes the king until he can kill him. The leaders of Latin American Republics do not want to scratch Castro's face. But I am confident that they would join us in any forward-moving program, such as the first step, so that they could employ it effectively against communism.

I think there is a possibility that the longer this situation drags out the more it will be subject to suspicion. The people will begin to suspect that nothing serious will happen. Then once more, just 15 minutes before it is too late, we will try to unite them in a great program. But our timing next time may be wrong, and it may be 15 minutes after it is too late. The time to act is now, when we

have earned the confidence and respect of the world.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Colorado.

Mr. DOMINICK. I wish to add my voice of commendation of the remarks of the Senator from South Dakota. It seems to me that this is the most important immediate step we could take. But I know some of the problems which will be encountered.

In June 1961, Representative ROGERS of Florida and I introduced identical measures in the House, designed to cut off all trade between the United States and Communist Cuba. The interesting thing was that when hearings were held before the committee, representatives of the State Department appeared in August 1961, and testified in opposition to the bills. In any event, we were able to have a bill reported by the committee and passed by the House. But it never got anywhere in the Senate.

It was not until February 1962, that the administration finally took action under the Trading With the Enemy Act in order to cut off trade between the United States and Cuba, but months too late to be able to do any real good.

So the Senator will encounter problems in trying to secure any positive action which is not initiated under executive responsibility solely and completely.

Second, I have been interested in and have been advocating for a long time a NATO conference under section 2 of the NATO Agreement, so that we could have an agreed treaty policy among the NATO nations with respect to trading with Communist countries. One of the things that concerns me is the evidence, which was shown so clearly in the Senator's speech, of the number of British ships which are trading with Cuba. There is no doubt that more British ships are trading with Cuba than ships of any other country. The other day I placed in the Record, in connection with another discussion on Cuba, the fact that the British have had an imbalance of trade of 98 million pounds with Soviet bloc countries in the past year. That is a large sum of money. It provides the Soviet bloc countries with the necessary sterling and dollar exchanges to enable them to proceed with Communist infiltration throughout the world.

It seems to me that we are doing exactly the same thing in permitting trade to continue with Cuba, a country only 90 miles away from our shore.

The Senator's statement that we can refuse our foreign aid and can prohibit the use of our ports to countries which are trading with Cuba is the first positive suggestion I have heard to bring home the reality of the problem to many countries which are solidly on our side in the overall effort to combat communism.

Mr. MUNDT. I deeply appreciate the historic documentation concerning the difficulties which confront Senators and Congressmen who are trying to pursue a minimum program of action against Cuba. I am quite certain that any suggestion from any source that promises to accomplish anything against Castroism

in Cuba will meet with resistance, at least until the letter-writing campaign between the K-Boys is terminated and we can find out what it is all about.

Representative Rogers of Florida, who joined in that grand effort, with the Senator from Colorado when the Senator was a Member of the other body, is a distinguished Member of the House. The people of Florida are the direct sufferers from some of the difficulties which arise from the establishment of communism in Cuba. I credit Representative Rogers with being one of the few administration followers who have had the courage to stand up and speak out against the craven do-nothing policy program toward Cuba.

I feel certain that we shall meet with further resistance; but I am sure that the kind of resistance we shall meet with can no longer hide behind the language screen which says, "What are we to do?—go to war against Cuba?"

The program I have recommended today is something which even the most imaginative writer in the White House cannot describe as an act of war. We could put together all the Sorensons, all the Schlesingers, all the Harvard men, and ask, "How are you going to describe as an act of war an American trade and aid policy operated under our authority as a sovereign nation?"

So the Administration ought to consider the question: "Are you serious about communism when it is close to our shores? Or are you serious only about communism in Vietnam or Laos, 7,000 miles away?"

Unless the administration completely lacks confidence in its own ability to lead, I challenge it now to take the initiative in doing those things which are short of war, which can be done to start the beginning of the end of Communist Castroism in Cuba.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR MORSE ON 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF CITY LIGHT, CASCADE LOCKS, OREG.

MR. MORSE. Mr. President, when I was in Oregon over the weekend, I made a major policy speech to the people of my State, setting forth my views with respect to the sum of the electric power problems that confront the Pacific Northwest. I spoke with respect to such issues as interstate connection legislation and the Canadian Treaty negotiations. I made this speech at a banquet at Cascade Locks, Oreg. The banquet was in celebration of the 25th anniversary of the purchase by the city of a block of power from the Bonneville Administration. The city of Cascade Locks was the first of our municipalities to purchase a block of power and to establish a municipal public power administration making use of the power generated by the Bonneville Power Administration.

I ask unanimous consent that the address I delivered at the Cascade Locks anniversary dinner on Saturday night be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR WAYNE MORSE ON THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF CITY LIGHT, CASCADE LOCKS, OREG., JULY 13, 1963

Mayor Miles, Judge Teunis Wyers, Bonneville Administrator Charles Luce, other distinguished guests and fellow Oregonians, it is a privilege and an appreciated compliment to be invited to deliver the principal address at this anniversary banquet. It was 25 years ago that Cascade Locks bought the first block of power sold by the Bonneville Administration. It was a historical event of great economic importance to Oregon, the Pacific Northwest and the entire Nation.

It is particularly fitting that the Honorable Charles Luce, the present Administrator of the Bonneville Administration should be one of our honored guests tonight. The Nation has been very fortunate in the appointment of Administrators of the Bonneville Administration ever since the passage of the Bonneville Act. However, we are particularly fortunate to have Charles Luce as the Administrator at this time when we see arising on the economic horizons new threatening storm clouds that may develop into a deluge of controversy over public versus private power policies.

I am confident that under Charles Luce's leadership the sunshine of reason will dissipate the gathering clouds of controversy. It is in the vital economic interest of all the people of our section of the country, including members of economic groups such as the stockholders of private utilities and their customers as well as members and customers of public preference groups, that gathering differences be resolved in a manner that will advance the legitimate joint economic interests of all.

However, now is the time to face up to these issues and try to settle them before advocates take irrefragable positions in respect to them. Charles Luce is particularly well qualified to help resolve any differences that may arise. His judicial temperament, his dedication to the public interest, his insistence upon fair play to the private utilities, the public utilities districts, the electric power consumer and the general public assure us of an industrial statesmanship so essential to a carrying out of the purposes and objectives of the Bonneville Act.

However, it is very important that we have open public discussion of these powerlines because they involve the economic business of all the people. Therefore I propose in this major policy speech tonight to deal with a few of the facts of our electric power problems and needs in the Pacific Northwest to call upon the many friends, supporters and beneficiaries of the Bonneville Act to rededicate themselves to its purposes and sound objectives. I would have this audience never forget that the Bonneville Act has been the most important stimulant in the development of private enterprise business and the expansion of our private economy in the Pacific Northwest that we have experienced within our economy during the past 25 years.

Businessman after businessman, operating his business within the economic environment of any one of Federal multipurpose dams in our section of the Nation, are the best possible witnesses in support of the public policy soundness of the Bonneville Act. These businessmen tell us that they never would have located their businesses where they did if it had not been for the low-rate electric power that the Bonneville Act in its administration has brought to Oregon and our neighboring States.

Thus it is a pleasure to be in Cascade Locks again. Your town has many features which make it a notable municipality. I came to speak about one of them: your role in initiation of the activities of the Bonneville Power Administration.

City Light in Cascade Locks has the dis-

tinguished of being the first recipient of power marketed by BPA. You are still reaping the benefits of that decision a quarter of a century ago. Today, residential use of electricity in Cascade Locks is three times the national average and yet you pay only one-third as much as the national average for each kilowatt-hour.

What happened in Cascade Locks on July 9, 1938, was the beginning of a chain of events which reshaped the social and economic structure of the Pacific Northwest.

When Cascade Locks received its first power from Bonneville Dam, only about 30 percent of Oregon's farms were electrified; today 99 percent have electricity.

The year before BPA power came to Cascade Locks, homeowners in Siletz, Oreg., paid \$51.60 a month for 500 kilowatts of electricity. Twenty-five years later, Siletz residents could get the same amount of power for \$8.

In 1938 the economy of our State was almost entirely dependent on lumbering, farming, mining, and fishing. There was little industry. BPA power brought Oregon six electro-process industries with a plant investment in excess of \$190 million, estimated payrolls of \$12,500,000 and 6,600 new jobs. Low-cost power from Bonneville nurtured the unprecedented expansion of our quick frozen food industry and electrified our sawmills, paper and plywood plants, and wood fabrication facilities which are one of Oregon's major sources of employment.

Here in Cascade Locks, City Light furnishes the power for the all-electric operation of one of the largest independent lumber mills in the Northwest, and I am advised City Light can accommodate almost any new industry with the same low-cost power at very little added investment.

Bonneville itself is a principal industry in Oregon with 1,000 employees, an annual payroll of nearly \$8 million, and an investment of \$166 million in power transmission equipment.

The Bonneville Power Administration did not introduce electricity to the Northwest. We had power before BPA. But it was expensive for all, prohibitively costly to many, and completely unavailable to some. What Bonneville brought to the Northwest was low-cost electricity distributed regionwide at a postage stamp rate—a rate which has remained unchanged for more than 25 years.

How did it do it? With 20 operating or authorized Federal multiple purpose water projects, 8,600 miles of Federal transmission line, an antimonopoly preference clause that give priority in sales to public agencies and co-ops, and a policy of making an abundance of cheap power available in even the most remote reaches of the Northwest.

It accomplished this feat in the face of the bitterest opposition from one to today's major beneficiaries—the Northwest's private power companies, who buy large quantities of BPA power and pay less for it than public agencies and co-ops.

Today, the limitation of its marketing area has put the Bonneville Power Administration into a financial problem. In the last 5 years, BPA has experienced deficits which have reduced its surplus by \$60 million. Although Bonneville is still ahead of the game, unless other solutions are successfully applied, it will be necessary to raise BPA rates to cover scheduled repayments.

During the same period that Bonneville's financial "cushion" decreased by \$60 million, some \$126 million worth of power went unsold—water wasted over the spillway. If a market had been found for only half this surplus secondary power, which is available on a nonfirm basis, there would have been no deficit.

A major electrical interconnection between the Northwest and California and the South-

west could be the means of marketing this power. An intertie would also permit sale of peaking capacity, allow firming up of substantial quantities of secondary power for use in the Northwest, and provide a means of taking advantage of diversity in peak loads between the two regions.

BPA has proposed two ties, one a 750-kilovolt direct current line to Hoover Dam in Nevada or Los Angeles, Calif., and the other a 500-kilovolt alternating current line extending to the Oregon-California border where it would link with facilities of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co.

Average annual net revenues to Bonneville in the first 10 years alone would be \$24.6 million, and large additional benefits thereafter. Net benefits for the Northwest—including the non-Federal utilities of the region—are estimated to range up to \$872 million over the next 50 years.

This is an extremely lucrative proposal. These lines would pay for themselves in less than a decade. Benefit-cost ratio is about 3.5 to 1—a better economic justification than most recent hydroelectric projects in the Northwest. Because of the profitmaking potential of such an interconnection, seven non-Federal proposals to accomplish all or part of the job have been submitted to Bonneville. However, none can show equal benefits.

California private power companies are seeking to take over this interconnection plan. The Pacific Gas & Electric Co. of California, which has absorbed 520 other firms to make it the biggest privately owned utility in the country, wants to control the flow of power between the Pacific Northwest and California. Southern California Edison Co. seeks to substitute a line from its service area to Phoenix, Ariz., for the Federal direct current line through Nevada. The California companies suggest that they become the sole channel for distribution of Northwest power in California. Under their plan, all BPA surplus power which is exported for sale outside the region would be sold to Pacific Gas & Electric. Other potential customers could gain access to this power only on terms and conditions laid down by Pacific Gas & Electric.

Last month the president of the Puget Sound Power & Light Company declared that "whoever controls transmission lines these days controls the works." The California companies would obtain control under their proposal.

This is no new attitude on the part of private power companies. These private utilities fought Bonneville Dam and Grand Coulee. They opposed expansion of the BPA grid. They fought a high dam at Hells Canyon. They worked against the Hanford project.

These private utilities are obligated primarily to their stockholders and therefore they naturally are concerned about making good profits. There is nothing wrong in that from their standpoint. Since 1950 public and co-op systems in the Northwest have made rate reductions of \$30 million while private utilities of this region have increased rates by \$25 million.

Low cost power is a key to the Northwest's economic growth. We are thousands of miles from major markets, insulated from major centers of commerce by high freight rates. Our economy remains resource oriented, strongly sensitive to dips in the business cycle and seasonal unemployment. Low cost power has helped bring us industry and stable payrolls. Low cost power permits us to compete with other sections of the country. It is an equalizer which compensates for our isolated location. If BPA power rates go up, chances of attracting new industry—or even retaining full operation of existing plants—are proportionally decreased.

BPA's \$520 million transmission grid constitutes about 80 percent of all the high-

voltage lines in the Pacific Northwest. Bonneville provides 60 percent of all our power. An increase in rates will have widespread impact on our State and region.

Somebody is going to build an interconnection between the Northwest and Southwest. It is too good a deal to pass up. Any intertie can help Bonneville's financial picture. But a Federal interconnection is the best bet for keeping our power rates down.

The Federal Government should build the needed tie lines. The Bonneville Act of 1937 directs the BPA to interconnect with other Federal systems and publicly owned power projects. Substantial economies are possible by linking such systems as the Central Valley project in northern California, the Hoover-Parker-Davis dams and the Colorado River Storage project in the Southwest. Local public power groups, rural electric cooperatives and State agencies also stand to benefit.

The administration has asked for funds in the current appropriation bill to build to the Oregon-California border. What logic dictates that a Federal line must terminate at this point for the benefit of private parties? Some 75 percent of the surplus power available for export in the Northwest is at Federal dams. Why should BPA depend on private power companies for its marketing arrangements? Federal lines would be common carriers, available at cost to all—including private power companies. Why should a private monopoly be substituted?

Implementation of the treaty with Canada for cooperative development of the upper Columbia River will result in the equivalent of another Grand Coulee Dam for the Northwest, but conclusion of this arrangement swings on the ability of Canada to market its share of treaty power in the Southwest via an intertie. Are negotiations between the United States and Canada to be subject to the veto of a private power company?

Any intertie requires as a prelude passage of legislation to prohibit the drain of Federal power out of the Northwest to the detriment of the needs of our region. We have passed such a bill in the Senate, and it is pending in the House of Representatives. An amendment has been added there, requiring enactment of new authorizing legislation before the 750-kilovolt line may be built directly from the Columbia River to the southern California market. If the private utilities amendment remains part of the preference measure, the bill itself will certainly be vetoed.

But our concern with the progress of this measure should not blind us to the reason for its existence—the desirability of an intertie to better BPA's fiscal situation. Our aim is not to build a Chinese Wall around the Northwest but to facilitate sale of surplus to protect our supply of low cost power.

In a recent speech on the floor of the Senate I reminded the Federal Power Commission of its independent jurisdiction—indeed its obligation—to decide the question of the authority of the Washington Public Power Supply System to go outside the State of Washington to construct a dam on the Middle Snake in Oregon and Idaho, notwithstanding a decision by the Oregon Federal District Court that Washington Public Power Supply System lacks such authority under Washington State law. Editorializing about that speech, the Oregonian said: "Senator Morse's position appears to be founded on ideological grounds rather than legal grounds." This, apparently because I also reminded FPC of its mandate to provide for maximum development in the public interest of the publicly owned rivers of this country.

Where the only resource concerned or affected is power generation at a low-head site, there is every reason for dams to be those of private utilities. I have always supported their construction of low-head dams at such sites.

But where there is the prospect for a multi-purpose project, that is another matter.

The editors of the Oregonian know just as well as I do that the private power companies which comprise Pacific Northwest Power Company are not proposing maximum development of the Middle Snake, any more than Idaho Power Company did a decade ago. In its zeal to champion Pacific Northwest Power Company, the Oregonian camouflaged the substance of my legal position. It obviously did so because it could not refute that position.

The point I made is in fact irrefutable. The FPC, not having been a party to the litigation in the Oregon District Court, is free to deal independently with the issue decided by that court. Moreover, no prohibition in State law nor any lack of authority under State law can void an FPC license or bar the exercise of the FPC's paramount Federal licensing power. This has been the repeated holding of the U.S. Supreme Court. Irrespective of State law, then, the FPC can endow WPPSS—a public body competent under Washington State law to generate and sell power—with independent Federal authority under a Federal license to construct a dam on a navigable stream belonging to the United States located outside the State of Washington.

This is a far cry from the Oregonian's characterization of my legal position as being that a Federal court has no authority over the Federal Power Commission.

In a second editorial, the Oregonian again bleated the call of the Pacific Northwest Power Co. with respect to the fish problem on the Middle Snake. After one private utility has killed off what fish there were above the Salmon River, we are told that only another private utility can save the fish below the Salmon.

I think the people of this area have seen enough wreckage of Snake River resources at the hands of private utilities.

It is regrettable that the Oregonian seeks its legal advice from patently biased quarters. It is even more regrettable that the Oregonian fails so often to speak out on major power issues on behalf of the general public interest, in the great tradition of the press.

Interconnection of the Pacific Northwest and Southwest, and development of the Middle Snake River are issues which will help shape the future of the Northwest, just as did the arrival of BPA power in Cascade Locks. If we allow private parties to work out their own special solutions, outside the framework of the public interest, we have only ourselves to blame.

It will be most regrettable if controversies over the intertie issue and the maximum power development of the Middle Snake are not settled on a negotiated basis that places the long-time public interest ahead of all other issues.

For a good many years, great progress was being made in the maximum river basin development of the Pacific Northwest, based upon a program of joint venture between Government and private utilities that would result in the pooling of power and a fair distribution of that power to the private utilities for sale to their customers and to public power bodies for distribution to their customers. Such a program was aimed at providing people living in the great potential hydroelectric power areas of the West with low-cost power so vitally needed for an ever expanding economy, new job opportunities, new business, and an ever better standard of living for our people.

I have always supported such a program, and I will continue to do so.

It gives assurance to private utilities of an adequate supply of power, fair and reasonable but not exorbitant profits and a maximum rather than an inadequate development of the hydroelectric power re-